THE

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

APRIL, 1832.

Religious Communications.

LECTURES ON THE SHORTER CATECHISM OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES—ADDRESSED TO YOUTH.

LECTURE LXVI.

Having shown what are the *inward* means by which the benefits of the great redemption of Christ are to be obtained—faith and repentance—we are now to consider the *outward* means—And our Catechism teaches us, that "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption, are his ordinances, especially the word, sacraments and prayer; all which are made effectual to the elect for salvation."

You may observe that this answer speaks not only of *outward*, but of *ordinary* means—by which latter designation we are to understand those means which are most commonly and extensively used, and most frequently blessed, for the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints. All the ordinances of God are to be regarded, and are of great use in the church. These, in our larger Catechism, are said to be—in addition to those mentioned in the answer before us—"church government and discipline; the ministry and maintenance thereof; swearing by the name of God; and vowing unto him." These, as being divine ordinances; that is, *commanded duties* in the divine word, are all to be regarded and observed, in their proper place and season; "yet *the word, sacraments and prayer*, are the *chief, or principal* outward means, for communicating the benefits of redemption."*

The providences of God are doubtless frequently blessed, to awaken and alarm careless sinners, and to correct and recall backsliding believers; but this is done, only by leading them to reflect on their duty as taught and enjoined in the written word of God; and therefore the providences themselves, are not, in the Catechism, considered as standing on the same ground with those which are more directly means of grace.

There are two ideas of great importance, that here demand your most serious attention. The first is, that the means have no inherent efficacy in themselves, to produce the blessings of redemption—This is distinctly taught in the answer before us, where it is said that they are "*made* effectual to salvation." *Means* are not *ends*, and are never to be rested in, till the end is attained, for which alone they are used. To this error of resting in means, there is

* Fisher.

in many a strong, and often, it is to be feared, a fatal proneness. They give a formal, and perhaps a pretty constant attendance, on at least some of the means of grace; and they think that this places them in a very hopeful way. Thus they quiet all their fears and anxieties, in regard to their souls' eternal welfare; till at last, they perish in an unconverted, unsanctified state. Remember then, my dear youth, that till the means of grace have been made effectual to bring saving grace to your precious immortal spirits, they have not answered the only design for which they were appointed; and that if you die without this end being reached, all the means of grace you have ever enjoyed, will only have served to aggravate your final condemnation. Sensible of this, look constantly through the means, to that God who alone can give them their proper effect; and pray, whenever you use them, that he would take them, as instruments, into his own hand, and make them powerful and efficient, to bring you into a state of reconciliation with himself, through Jesus Christ.

The other idea to which I have referred is, that the blessings of redemption, or salvation, are not to be expected without the use of the appointed means of grace. That God could convert sinners, without any of the instrumentality which he has ordained for this purpose, there is no reason to doubt—He could, certainly, in an instant, without the intervention of any means, change the hardest and most rebellious human heart that ever existed, and form it to love and delight in himself: And something of this kind appears in fact to have taken place, in the conversion of the apostle Paul. At the moment when he said, "Lord, what wouldest thou have me to do?" his heart appears to have been changed; yet means were still ordered to be used, for his instruction, direction and comfort. This case, however, was strictly one of miracle; a departure from the ordinary way, in which God's mercy to sinners is exhibited. We know that in the usual dispensation of his grace, after human beings have attained the full exercise of their reasoning and moral powers, his method is to work upon them only through the instrumentality of second causes. Indeed the whole of his ordinary dispensation of mercy towards mankind, is a dispensation of means. Hence, those who talk of sinners loving God before they can with propriety use any means, do, unless they look for a miracle, point out a way of obtaining salvation as really contrary to that which God has appointed, as those who expect salvation in the neglect of all means. In reality, these extremes, as often happens with extremes, meet in a point—They both expect an end without means. The only difference is, that the former class think that means are to be used for the *increase* of grace, after grace has been communicated without them. Never, beloved youth, never expect that God will meet with you in a saving manner, without the diligent, conscientious, prayerful, and persevering use of all the means appointed by him, and adapted to your existing state and character. Avoid, especially, the two opposite errors, of resting in means, while the end for which they were ordained has not been reached; and of neglecting the use of *means*, under the vain and arrogant expectation, that God, in your case, will depart from his ordinary method of bringing sinners to himself.

The answer before us says, that the ordinances of God's appointment are made effectual to the *elect*—and the implication is, to the *elect only*—for salvation. This is

a solemn truth, which all observation and experience strongly confirm. How often do we see that among individuals, who have enjoyed all the same advantages of instruction, warning, reproof, and entreaty, some are brought to a saving knowledge of the Redeemer, and others remain, apparently, destitute to the last of any salutary impressions. To what, I ask, but to the distinguishing grace of God, can this difference be rationally attributed? Doubtless it is true, that the one class made a right improvement, and the other did not, of the privileges equally enjoyed by both. But the question still returns, why did one make the right improvement, and the other not make it?—The grace of God alone, is the only assignable cause.

But, my young friends, I solemnly warn you, not to abuse this truth. Say not, that if it is uncertain, after all, that the means of grace will effect your salvation, you may as well neglect as use them. Do you not see, both the absurdity and the danger of such a conclusion? By neglecting the means of grace, you pass sentence on yourselves at once, that perdition is your lot. If you belong to the elect of God, you certainly will use the means, and use them faithfully. All your hope lies here. There is not a child of God on earth, that became so without the use of means; and there is not one whose state, before conversion, was not exactly as uncertain as yours is now. Let your resolution then be this—"I will neglect none of the means which God makes effectual to all the elect. I will use the means with all diligence, fidelity, and earnest prayer, that they may be blessed to my eternal well being. Doing thus, I may hope, and I will hope, that the event will prove to me, as it has to others, that I have been chosen and ordained to life everlasting. If I am enabled by the grace of God cordially to embrace the gospel offer, I shall, in that way, make my 'calling and election sure;' and in no other way can I ever know, on this side of eternity, whether I am one of the elect or not—unless, indeed, I make and keep the awful resolution, that I will not seek salvation, in the only ordinary way in which it is ever found."

Oh think much, I beseech you, on what is comprehended in the inconceivably interesting word, SALVATION! It implies, even in the present life, a begun deliverance from all sin and misery, and a begun possession of all the happiness which arises from the friendship of God, a sanctified providence, and the hope of eternal felicity. In the world to come, it implies the two-fold blessedness, of an assured deliverance from the deserved punishment of sin in all the horrors of the second death; and an exaltation to all the high and ineffable bliss of the paradise of God; where, with the General Assembly and church of the first born whose names are written in heaven, and with an innumerable company of angels, every saved soul shall spend an eternity, in such delights as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived. This is the *great salvation* at which you are to aim, in the use of the means of grace. Need I ask, if it is not worth every effort, and every agony, which its attainment may demand!

"Salvation! O the joyful sound!
'Tis pleasure to our ears;
A sovereign balm for every wound,
A cordial for our fears.

Buried in sorrow and in sin,
At hell's dark door we lay;
But we arise, by grace divine,
To see a heavenly day.

Salvation!- let the echo fly
The spacious earth around;
While all the armies of the sky
Conspire to raise the sound."

WITHERSPOON'S ESSAY ON JUSTIFICATION.

(Concluded from page 98.)

But this is not all; for the reception of the doctrine of imputed righteousness is not merely to be considered as the best means, comparatively, of producing, preserving and increasing our sanctification and purity, as sure and effectual, while others are precarious, but it is the only way, and all others are absolutely insufficient for the purpose. If this be indeed the doctrine of Christ, the Scripture-method of salvation, then it is not only true, but a fundamental truth. Of this we are frequently and solemnly assured in the word of God. "I am the way," says our Saviour, "and the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."* So say the apostles Peter and John, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved."† It is, therefore, in vain for any to expect an effectual change of life, but by an acquaintance with Christ, and him crucified. We have indeed the clearest evidence from experience, that no human reason, no argument whatever, drawn from worldly convenience, is at all sufficient to contend with violent and sinful habits. We see many examples of persons of excellent understanding and knowledge in other matters, nay, who can reason strongly and justly upon the bad consequences of vice in others, sometimes even in themselves, who will yet go on to ruin their name, family, fortune and health, while they are slaves to evil habits: nothing will change them but the grace of God.

And as we have seen above, that our own righteousness, in its best state, is wholly ineffectual for our acceptance with God, so all who have any expectations of this kind from it plainly show, that they have such defective views of the extent and obligation of the divine law, as are inconsistent with an unfeigned universal submission to it. This is a matter of the last importance, and ought to be particularly recommended to the serious consideration of such as may have, at some times, some imperfect convictions; such as from a weariness and satiety of sinning may give a temporary preference to a life of religion, and raise a feeble and ineffectual wish with Balaam, that they might "die the death of the righteous." They ought to be told, that no endeavours to be a little better than before, no abstinence from some sins as a kind of atonement for others retained, no resolutions taken in their own strength, no righteousness of their own, offered or trusted in as a matter of their justification, will be accepted, or is worthy of being so; that nothing will be truly effectual, till they see their lost condition, and believe in Christ, first for pardon, and then for sanctification, "to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved."* If they have any other plea, any other ground of hope and trust, it shall undoubtedly fail them; they must remain under a sentence of just and legal condemnation, and shall finally perish; for "he that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. John, iii. 36."†

* John, xiv. 6. † Acts, iv. 12.

* Eph. i. 6.

† The application of these passages of Scripture, to the particular principles above maintained, will, perhaps, be thought to include in it a very severe and uncharitable condemnation of many Christians, who differ in judgment upon the point of justification. And indeed I pretend no great friendship to the sentiments so frequently expressed of late, "That it

I am naturally led to conclude this subject, by observing, that the importance, efficacy and necessity of the imputed righteousness of Christ, shows how much it is the duty of all ministers of the gospel to make it the main and leading theme of their sermons. The preaching of the gospel is by the apostle Paul, in a very just and expressive manner, styled preaching "the unsearchable riches of Christ." In him every prophecy, precept, promise and truth is centered. His character and work as a Saviour is held forth in a variety of lights in the sacred oracles, and in every opening or view that is given us, so to speak, of the dispensations of Divine Providence and grace, he is the chief figure, or the termination of the prospect. If, therefore, we would know what esteem is due to our Redeemer in our hearts, and how high a place he ought to hold in our views of religion, let us observe the regard paid to him by the sacred writers. They derive almost all their motives to every moral duty, from what he hath done, and is still doing for us, and seem to delight even in the repetition of his name. I am persuaded those who are accustomed to the devout and serious perusal of the word of God will not reckon it "enthusiasm," when I say, that these writers appear to be warmed and elevated above their ordinary measure, when they celebrate his salvation; and that both in the Old and New Testament, wherever we meet with any passage singularly lofty and sublime, there we may be sure that Christ the Redeemer is the immediate theme.

Justification by the free grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, was the doctrine taught among Christians, in the earliest and purest ages of the church. And their departure from it was the prelude to that universal corruption of faith and worship, that relaxation of discipline, and dissolution of manners, which took place in the ages following. It is also very remarkable, that this doctrine was always fully and distinctly taught in those churches which never submitted to the tyranny, or received the corruptions of the Romish Antichrist; I mean the churches of the Piedmontese valleys, which, by so many judicious writers, are supposed to be

is a small matter what a man believes, if his life be good." The assertion might, perhaps, be allowed, if it did not contain a foolish and unreasonable supposition, that a man may believe wrong, and yet lead as good a life as he that believes right; the contrary to which will always be expected by him who gives credit to the word of God, that his people are "sanctified through the truth." As to Socinians and Pelagians, who are the greatest opposers of the truths above defended, I never did esteem them to be Christians at all; so the consequence, with regard to them, may be easily admitted. But it will be thought hard to say the same thing of the Arminians. However, if the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of our justification, and the reception of him in this character the true principle of sanctification, I do not see how we can avoid concluding the danger of those who act upon any other plan. And yet I am persuaded there have been, and are many good men among them: which may be accounted for in this manner, that their hearts are better than their understandings; and they are habitually under the government of principles, which, through some mistaken views, and groundless fears of their abuse, they speak of more sparingly, or rather seem to establish the contrary positions. The proof of this assertion I take from their own writings, particularly from the difference between their sermons and other discourses, and those forms of prayer which they have drawn up, and not only recommended to others, but left behind them as a witness of their own exercise in their closets. If they be supposed to feel the sentiments which they express in their prayers, it can easily be made appear, that these sentiments can only be dictated by the doctrine of free grace. If what they say of themselves be true, in its natural and obvious meaning, and if they believe it, which charity obliges us to suppose, it must be altogether vain to lay the least stress upon their own righteousness for their acceptance with God.

the two witnesses mentioned in the Revelation, who fled into the wilderness from the persecution of the beast, and prophesied in sackcloth.

The accounts which have been transmitted to us of the principles held by them, long before the reformation, plainly show, that they maintained this doctrine from the beginning. And as it is well known that the reformation took its first rise from the gross and scandalous application of the doctrine of merit in indulgences, so all the reformers, without exception, were strenuous assertors of free grace. This was reckoned by them "articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ," by which the church must stand or fall. Particularly, our reformers, in both parts of this island, agreed in preaching the same doctrine, and the eminent piety of our fathers is a standing evidence of its force and efficacy.

It doth not, perhaps, become, and probably it would not be safe, for me to enter into a particular examination of the manner of preaching in the present age; and therefore my reflections upon that subject shall be very few and general. What is most obvious in our present situation, and what ought to affect Christians with most concern, is, the great prevalence of infidelity. This is the more surprising, that we have never wanted, and do not at present want, many able and eminent writers to stand up in defence of the gospel, and refute the changeable and inconsistent reasonings of infidels, whatever form they from time to time think fit to assume; and on whatever principles they pretend to build. But, I am afraid, the best defence of all is but too much neglected, viz. Zealous assiduous preaching the great and fundamental truths of the gospel, the lost condemned state of man by nature, and the necessity of pardon through the righteousness, and renovation by the Spirit of Christ. This would make a far greater number of those who call themselves by the name of Christ, Christians indeed. And the visible efficacy of his doctrine, would be a sensible demonstration of its truth and divine original. If these truths are not contradicted, it may be safely said, that they are by many kept more out of view than formerly. And surely we have no great cause to boast of our improvements in the preaching art, if its goodness is to be determined, like that of a tree, not by its blossoms, but its fruits.

There is one observation which may satisfy us, that the preaching of the cross of Christ will most effectually promote real reformation. It is, that those preachers who (to say no more) approach nearest to making our own merit and obedience the ground of our acceptance with God, very seldom, if ever, give any alarm to the consciences of their hearers. Let them recommend ever so pure and high a standard of morals, they are heard without fear, and, if they preach elegantly, with pleasure, even by the most profligate. To such preachers, all vain worldly-minded people, usually attach themselves, where they have not cast off the very form of religion; but most part of serious Christians, together with professing hypocrites, who cannot easily be distinguished in this world, always follow preachers of another strain. It is easy to see the reason of this from what hath been said above; there are none who set the strictness and obligation of the law, the holiness and justice of God, in so awful a light, as those who believe there is no shelter from the sanction of the law, and the wrath of of an offended God, but in the blood of Christ. Perhaps, I am already ensnared and exposed to censure, by affirming that there

are among us preachers of different strains. But it is so certain a truth, that I cannot deny it; and so important, that I will not disguise it.

Upon the whole, as the present aspect of publick affairs, as the state of the world, and character of the age, loudly call upon all of every station to exert themselves with diligence for the support and revival of truth and righteousness: I hope the ministers of the gospel will promote this end, by zealously labouring to bring men to the saving knowledge of Christ, "the way, and the truth, and the life —the foundation—the tried stone —the precious corner stone," the strength and security of the building. To deny, explain away, or neglect to impart the truths of the everlasting gospel, is the way to leave the world in wickedness; but, by preaching them in purity, and with simplicity, which, we have reason to think, will be accompanied with "the demonstration of the Spirit," sinners are reconciled unto God, the power of sin is broken in them, the divine image is formed in them, and upon these truths their hopes of eternal life must rest and depend. Let us be ever ready to say with the apostle Paul, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."* And let us quicken our diligence, and animate our endeavours, by expressing, with the psalmist David, our faith in the perpetuity of his kingdom. "His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him; all nations shall call him blessed. Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever; and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen and Amen."†

* Gal. vi. 14. † Psal. lxxii. 17, 18, 19.

From the Cincinnati Standard.

LIFE OF THE APOSTLE JOHN.

The history of this holy apostle, as well as that of the others, is involved in obscurity. He was the son of Zebedee, and brother of James the senior. He resided at Bethsaida,* in Galilee, and was by occupation a fisherman.

John and James were distinguished for their fidelity, perseverance and boldness, in the cause of their master, who called them sons of thunder.

There were three, who enjoyed peculiar favours, and were admitted to witness many very interesting scenes in the presence of the Saviour; of these, John was one. He was present when the daughter of Jairus was raised; at the transfiguration of Jesus on the mount; and saw his agony in the garden; indeed, he was that apostle who was peculiarly loved by Jesus. This John, this beloved apostle, was the only one, whose love and courage were strong enough to impel him to follow Jesus to Calvary, and see him crucified, and hear his agonizing expiring groans.

Soon after the crucifixion of the Saviour, John, and eight other fellow apostles, returned to their former employment of fishing at the sea of Galilee; but they soon abandoned this business for that of becoming fishers of men. John

* This city was situated near the north end of the sea of Galilee, on the *west* side, between two rivers, not far from the sea shore, about eight miles west of Choraizin, which is on the *east* side of the river Jordan, and directly at the north end of the sea. Bethsaida was five miles west of Capernaum,—four, north-east of Magdala, —12, north of Tiberias,—18, east of Cana, —and 68, east of north of Jerusalem. It lies in Galilee, in the territory of Naphthali, a place remarkable for deer, and very commodious for fishing. It was enlarged and beautified by Philip the Tetrarch, who called it Julia, after its improvement, out of respect to a daughter of the emperor, Augustus Cæsar. It was also the former residence of Philip, Andrew and Peter.

now commenced preaching the gospel, and was viewed as a pillar in the Christian churches of Judea. It is supposed he continued to labour here, till near the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, when he travelled into Asia Minor, and preached for some time to the church in Ephesus.

After his residence and faithful instruction, in this place, he was, as he expresses it in Revelation, banished "for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus," to the Isle of Patmos.* This probably took place in the time of the severe persecutions during the reign of Domitian, one of the Roman emperors. Banishment was not a punishment enjoined by the Mosaick laws; but after the captivity, it was introduced among the Jews, and was in practice among the Romans, who called it "*diminutio capitis*," because the person exiled lost his citizenship, and the city of Rome a head, or citizen. There was also an exile called "*disportatio*," the effect of which was, the confiscation of property; the criminal was put on board a vessel and transported to some island selected by the emperor, and there doomed to perpetual banishment, or at least during the life of the emperor who designated the place. This *latter* mode was the condition of St. John. After the death of this inveterate enemy of christianity, it is supposed he returned to Asia Minor, and there preached and lived to the age of almost a hundred years, having survived all his brother apostles. He is thought to have died a natural death in the city of Ephesus, during the reign of the emperor Trajan, and was the only one who was not honoured with martyrdom.

The time of John's writing is uncertain, though probably after his return from exile, and near the close of the first century. It seems that he wrote at the express solicitations of the churches in Asia Minor, where he had faithfully preached, and by whom he was greatly beloved.

One object seems to be the refutation of the errors propagated by Cerinthus and the Gnostics, who taught many absurd notions respecting God and Jesus Christ, to accomplish which, he is more particular and explicit in some respects than the other apostles.

* This island is in the Archipelago, which lies between Achaia and Macedonia on the west, and Asia Minor on the east. It is about 100 miles west of Miletus, which is on the main, in the west part of Asia Minor; 110 south-westerly from Ephesus, and 620 miles north-westerly from Jerusalem. This is the place to which St. John was banished, "for the word of God."

The following lines, copied from the Boston Recorder, are from the pen of Mrs. Sigourney.

ON THE DEATH OF THE REV. ELIAS CORNELIUS, D. D.

"*All ye that are about him, bemoan him; and all ye that know his name, say, How is the* strong staff *broken! and the* beautiful rod."—Jeremiah, xlviii. 17.

It cannot be, it cannot be, that thou art on thy bier!—
But yesterday in all the prime of life's unspent career.
I've seen the forest's noblest tree laid low when lightnings shine,
And the column in its majesty torn from the temple-shrine;
But little deem'd that ice so soon would check thy vital stream,
Or the sun that soar'd without a cloud, thus veil its noon-tide beam.

I've seen thee in thy glory stand, while all around was hush'd,
And seraph wisdom from thy lips, in tones of musick gush'd;
For thou with willing hand didst lay, at joyous morning's hour,
Down at the feet of Him who gave thy beauty and thy power,—
Thou for the helpless sons of wo didst plead with words of flame,
And boldly strike the rocky heart, in thy Redeemer's name.

And lo! that withering race, who fade as dew 'neath summer's ray,
Who like the rootless weed are toss'd from their own earth away,
Who trusted to a nation's vow, but found that faith was vain,
And to their fathers' sepulchres, return no more again,—
They need thy blended eloquence of lip and eye and brow,
They need the righteous as a shield,—why art thou absent now?

Long shall thine image freshly dwell beside their ancient streams,
Or 'mid their wanderings far and wide shall gild their alien dreams;—
For heaven to their sequester'd haunts thine early steps did guide,
And the Cherokee hath blest thy prayer, his cabin-hearth beside,—
The Osage orphan meekly breath'd her sorrow to thine ear,
And the lofty warrior knelt him down with strange, repentant tear.

I see a consecrated throng of youthful watchmen rise,
Still girding on for Zion's sake, their heaven-wrought panoplies;—
These in their solitudes obscure thy generous ardour sought,
And gathering with a tireless hand, up to the temple brought;
These, when the altar of their God they serve with hallowed zeal,
Shall wear thy memory on their heart, an everlasting seal.

I hear a voice of wailing, from the islands of the sea,
Salvation's distant heralds mourn on heathen shores for thee,—
Thy constant love like Gilead's balm, refresh'd their weary mind,
And with the holy EVARTS' name, thine own was strongly twin'd;
But thou from their astonish'd gaze hast like a vision fled,
Just wrapp'd his mantle round thy breast, then join'd him with the dead.

Farewell! we yield thee to the grave with many a bitter tear,
Though 'twas not meet a soul like thine should longer tarry here;
Fond clustering hopes have sunk with thee that earth can ne'er restore;
Love casts a garland on thy turf that may not blossom more;
But thou art where the dream of Hope doth in fruition fade,
And love immortal and refined glow on without a shade.

Hartford, Feb. 12, 1832. L. H. S.

TRANSLATION OF THE LATIN HYMN,

In the March No. of Ch. Adv.

O Lord my God, I have hoped in thee;
O my dear Jesus, now liberate me!
In gall[illegible] chains, in grievous pains,
With s[illegible]ng desire, I seek thee.
In weakness, and groaning, and bending the knee,
I adore, I implore that thou liberate me.

March 19, 1832. J. C.

Miscellaneous.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF REV. JACOB GREEN, A. M.

SECTION SIXTH.

(*Continued from p.* 102.)

Of my Tenets or Doctrinal Sentiments.

As to church government, I am a true Protestant; but am no Quaker, or Anabaptist. Nor am I an Episcopalian, according to the church of England; nor a Presbyterian, according to the church of Scotland. Neither am I a Congregationalist, as practised in any part of New England. I know not of any publick Formula, that fully expresses my sentiments. Dr. Watts's Treatise, entitled "*The Rational Foundation of a Christian Church*," is, in my view, the most rational and scriptural, of any thing I have seen upon

these subjects—I am for Presbyterian ordination, and Independent church government. I would have ministers ordained by ministers; and would have every single church, or congregation, possess the whole power of managing their own ecclesiastical affairs: and when any thing is too difficult to manage among themselves, leave it to some disinterested neighbouring churches, to advise and assist them. But no Council, Presbytery, or Synod, have power to govern, or determine any thing for a particular church, any farther than that church submits or leaves the case to them.

Farther—I am so far Presbyterian, as to think that besides the minister, or teaching elder, in every church, it is proper, it is rational, useful and scriptural, to have lay elders, as well as deacons—So far as I understand their mode, the dissenting churches in South Britain, such as were those of Dr. Watts, Dr. Doddridge, and many others, were, and are, in a practice that I nearly concur with; and I suppose they find no difficulty in practising in their method.*

As to articles of faith, I am also a true Protestant: and I need not say I am no Arian, Socinian, Antinomian, or Arminian. From my

* The author of this sketch was plainly an Independent, or Congregationalist, in the essential principles of church government. Yet so long as he remained a member of the Presbytery of New York, into which he was introduced by his early friends and patrons, Dickinson and Burr, he never disturbed the peace, or violated the order of the church, of which he was a member: And when he thought he was called in duty to speak and act in a manner that was not Presbyterian, he sought, in a peaceful and orderly manner, a separation from that church; agreeably to a fundamental article agreed on in the year 1757, between the Synods of New York and Philadelphia, when they came together after a long separation. This article Mr. Green pleaded, and left the Presbytery to which he belonged without any censure; as did three others, who associated with him, and formed the presbytery of Morris County, of which some account will hereafter appear.

Why will not those who are now members of the Presbyterian church, and whose doctrinal sentiments and congregational notions differ more widely from our standards, than did those of Mr. Green and his associates—why will they not take the same honest, frank, and consistent course, that was taken by these worthy men? Our controversy with them would cease at once, if they would place themselves where they ought to stand—by themselves. But to remain connected with a church, some of whose most important doctrines they really disapprove; and whose ecclesiastical order they dislike and endeavour to change—is this right?—If it is, we cannot tell what is wrong.

Probably some of our readers will think it a little strange that the sentiments of the Editor of the Christian Advocate, on the subject of church government, should differ so widely from those of his father—a father, he will add, whose memory he greatly loves and venerates; and whose piety he fears he shall never equal. But the Editor can only say, he hopes that in this he has endeavoured to obey the reiterated admonition of the Great Head of the church—"One is your Master, even Christ: And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven." The deep conscientiousness of his father according to the flesh, in leaving the Presbyterian church, the Editor most fully believes; and he thinks he is himself truly conscientious, in remaining in it, and feeling an ardent attachment to it. Nor did the subject of the Sketch ever attempt to act as *father*, or *master*, in the sense of the quoted text, toward his son. In no one instance did he ever say a word, with a view to change the Presbyterian sentiments and attachments of the Editor, but left him entirely to his own opinions and choice, without the least interference or apparent reluctance. The Editor will add, that although from his first entrance on the gospel ministry, he was decidedly a Presbyterian in sentiment, yet he was inclined to a very lax administration of the Presbyterian system, till what he saw, in a journey through New England, more than forty years ago, convinced him deeply and effectually, that a strict adherence to the Standards of the Presbyterian church, both in doctrine and government, must be the rock of its peace, and the shield of its purity. In other words, he was made a rigorous Presbyterian, by observing the fearful practical evils, attendant on the ecclesiastical system of Congregationalists and Independents.

youth, I had heard much said upon the principles that are called Calvinistick and Arminian; and when I thought at all, I approved moderate Calvinism, before I had any religion: And when I got my religion in the *New Light* time,* I became a more zealous Calvinist. I had a great aversion to the opposers of New Light religion; and those opposers in New England, where I then lived, were generally supposed to be Arminian, or tinged with Arminian principles.

When I settled in the ministry, I was led into Mr. Stoddard's notions of the sacraments, by Messrs. Dickinson, Burr, and some others, that I had a high opinion of. They were, in other respects, strong Calvinists, and zealous promoters of the reformation, or New Light religion; and opposite to those that I had been troubled with as opposers in New England. Hence I was influenced to think they were right in their notions of sacraments. My prepossession in their favour, together with some plausible arguments they used, induced me to embrace Stoddard's sentiments, which before I had thought were not right; and for some time, I practised on his scheme, in the admission of church members. But my church were not generally in that opinion, and I was not zealous to urge Stoddard's principles.

After I had been settled a few years, I was inclined to some notions that were Arminian, or that bordered upon Arminianism; especially as to the power of the creature, the freedom of the will, the origin of action, &c. I seemed also to have some notion that there might be a degree of acceptableness to God, in the religious duties of the unregenerate; which well agreed with the Stoddardian notion of unregenerate persons covenanting, and coming to the sacraments. But I continued not long in these notions; for when I came to weigh and consider things well, I found I held several inconsistent sentiments. My sentiments in general were Calvinistick—I was founded and established in these principles; and yet I found I had, in a measure, given in to several things that were Arminian, and quite inconsistent with my Calvinistick principles. I had been inclined to such notions of human freedom, the sufficiency of the creature, origin of power, duties of the unregenerate, their covenanting and using sacraments, as were not consistent with other sentiments which I firmly believed, which I had the fullest evidence of, and could clearly demonstrate. When I came to look thoroughly into things, I found that all the Arminian notions, or doctrines, were so connected that they must and would, stand or fall together —The same connexion I also found to be in Calvinistick sentiments.

Dr. Watts's *Terms of Christian Communion;* Edwards's *Inquiry concerning Qualifications for Sacraments*, and his book on *the Will*, were assistances to me in studying these points; and were a considerable means to help to bring me off from all the notions that bordered on Arminianism.

As it was with myself, so I sus-

* The doctrinal opinions of the first settlers of New England were those of the old Puritans, who, it is well known, were strict Calvinists. But before the time of Whitefield, opinions which were at least more Arminian than Calvinistick, but often a heterogeneous mixture of both, were considerably prevalent; and formality in religion was still more general. Hence the genuine Calvinism of Whitefield and Tennent, and their ardent zeal for vital, practical godliness, was called *New Light*. But in *the march of mind*, this light has been left so far behind, that it is now considered as *Old*, and the current *New Light*, of the present day, is something, that Whitefield and Tennent, were they now alive, would denounce with all their energy.

pect it is with many others—The reason that they are partly Calvinists, and partly Arminians, is, that they dare not look the Calvinistick principles through, follow them to their source, and receive them with all their consequences. They see some of them so clearly that they cannot but believe them; but follow them a little farther, they are shocked, they appear terrible —Here they drop them, and entertain some inconsistent notions for the remainder of their creed. They believe the perfections of God, and that he foreknew all things; but when from God's foreknowledge, wisdom, power and goodness any argue that the accomplishment of all things is, and will be, according to God's plan—

Here the Sketch of Mr. Green's life, as written by himself, is abruptly terminated, by the loss of the last leaf of his manuscript. A member of the sentence which follows the above, or of which it is a part, remains, but it is not finished. Some account of the last thirteen years of his life, we hope to give in the next number of our work.

MENTAL SCIENCE.

Uses and Distinctions of Human Power.

The department of mental science, with which we head this article, is at all times important. But at this time there is an importance attached to its discussion, of absorbing interest. The philosophical speculations of the age are leading theologians astray, perverting the holy scriptures, unsettling the principles of orthodoxy, and exerting a mischievous influence in practical duties. What can, therefore, be more interesting to the Christian publick than the discussion of those points, where philosophy has concentrated its subtleties and force, to undermine the truth and pervert the spirit of the gospel. This may sound to some like a tone of needless alarm, others may smile at the discomfiture of our feelings; while not a few may think we attach undue importance to the topicks, which we have promised to examine in this article. Be all this as it may, we honestly believe that orthodoxy, truth and practical godliness, are more endangered by certain philosophical speculations on the doctrine and relations of human ability, than from all other speculations of the age. There seems to us more danger of undermining the citadel of truth, by errors of this class, than by any, or all others. When an errorist attacks, directly, the doctrines of grace, such as atonement and justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ, we meet him with a "thus saith the Lord," and feel secure in the argument. But when he comes with his false philosophy, and succeeds in perverting the views of human character, sin and ability, he has fixed a standard of interpretation which he applies to the scriptures, and entirely changes the plainest declarations of God's word. By settling a principle of interpretation which disregards philology, analogy, and the *usus loquendi*, bringing language and doctrine to the test of a philosophical theory, the process of the interpreter is short, and the labour easy. It serves also to give men a vain and reckless confidence in the deductions of their own reasoning, the danger of which has been experienced in ages long since passed. But no disastrous results of former ages can alarm the speculatists of the above description. They stand upon their own imagined independence, and are intent upon some great improvements in theological doctrine. We do not suppose that all the errors in doctrine, which infest the

church, nor all the errors in practice, which abound at the present day, have their origin in the influence of the false philosophy to which we allude; but we do suppose that a very large share may be traced to this source. Our views will be developed on this subject, before we end the discussion.

We proceed now to redeem our pledge, given in the last number, on the subject of *moral ability*. It will be necessary to bear in mind some things which we have said of power, the idea of which is always gained from a connexion between cause and effect. Why do we speak of moral power? Is it not because we attach moral character or qualities, to effects or actions; and from this infer that something moral belongs to its source? Moral faculties, employed in producing moral effects, suggest the idea of what we call moral ability. What is it? Wherein does it differ from any other ability, except in the character of its source, and its effects? A question here occurs which ought to be distinctly understood and answered —What belongs to man of a moral nature; and why is it moral? An answer to this question might be gathered from what we have already said; but to prevent the necessity of turning back, and to present the facts in their proper relation to the topick now under examination, we recapitulate them in this place. *Moral* has relation to holiness, or sin, right, or wrong. That which is holy or sinful, right or wrong, is properly moral, and nothing else. There may be some things belonging to man, or done by him, which have no moral character. Whatever will not distinguish a good or holy being from a sinful being, has no moral quality; it is common to both. What distinguishes a holy from a sinful man? It must be something which belongs to mind, and not to matter. Is it intellect? Is it will? Is it heart? If we speak of each faculty in abstract terms, and by itself, neither will distinguish them. Good and bad men have understanding, heart and will; but in one man they are right, and in the other wrong. What is the primary ground of distinction; or, in other words, in which faculty is the foundation of this wide discrimination? To us the *heart* seems to answer the question. Good and bad men may perceive the same things, and choose the same things, to great extent, but the moment we examine the feelings, we perceive direct opposition. One loves, the other hates, holy things. It may be necessary to say here, that we admit a distinguishing difference, both in the exercises of intellect, and in volitions: And we hold the doctrine of divine illumination as a guidance. But the difference in the exercises of intellect, is in the degree of clearness in perceiving the truth. Wicked men must perceive something of the holiness and truth of God, else they would not hate them.

We consider the heart, or faculty of feeling, as possessing a moral character in itself; it is the primary spring or principle of action. Let this be right and the man is good, though his knowledge be limited or extensive; but if the heart be wrong, he is bad, however ignorant or informed. We do not say equally good or bad, whatever may be the extent of knowledge. But man is a moral *being*, because he has a faculty in its nature moral; it loves or hates holy objects. Man is a moral *agent*, because he has a principle of agency, and it belongs to his moral faculty: consequently man is a *moral agent*.

Now in order to apprehend clearly, the idea of moral power, take the following synopsis of several things already discussed. The *heart* is the principle of moral

agency, and is necessary to constitute man a moral agent, because without feeling he could not act, could not be blameable, or praiseworthy; and could not be rewarded with happiness or misery. The *understanding* is also necessary to moral agency. Not because it is a principle of action, but because unknown objects cannot affect the heart. It is the faculty of intelligence, through which the heart receives all its impressions of pleasure or disgust; and without which medium there could be no action. It is the office of the intellect to devise the means of obtaining the objects which please, and of avoiding those which pain the heart. In its moral relation, it is necessary to discern what is right and what is wrong; to know the reason of praise and blame, and the propriety of rewards and punishments. The *will* is also essential to moral agency. Obedient to the feelings of the heart, the will, or faculty of volition, directs the understanding and bodily motions to obtain or accomplish the objects agreeable to the heart, or to avoid those things which are disagreeable. The will is necessary to perform many, if not all, the duties involved in moral agency; and to manifest the character of the heart. These are the elements of a free moral agent. What now is his *moral* power? It is suggested by those moral elements, employed to produce moral results or effects. If man acts right or wrong, he has moral power; if he does both, he has power to do both. As we said before, that the principal idea of natural or physical power is the connexion between volition and the effect, or to have the substitute before mentioned, that which forms or sustains the connexion; so we say here, the leading thought, expressed in moral power, is the connexion between the feelings of the heart and the effects, or actions.

We proceed now with the main object of this article; some inquiries into the uses and applications of human power, together with certain uses made of the distinction between material and moral ability.

One general use of power is obvious from the preceding discussion. Men are by it constituted agents, and may be voluntarily employed to accomplish the purposes of God, and promote the welfare of their fellow men. Man's power may be employed for valuable purposes in his social state, and for his individual benefit. But is it always so employed? Far from it. The inquiry may be pursued; why not? What controls and perverts man's ability from obedience to his Maker, from his own and his fellow creature's happiness? This question deserves careful examination. We say the heart is the spring or source of action. Let this be right with God, and all will be right; let it be wrong, and all will be wrong. The desires and feelings will always express the character of the heart. Man's ability to do mischief, or *accomplish* that which is good, will depend upon his opportunities, means, sagacity, and intellectual discipline; but whether actually he do good or evil, depends on the temper of his heart.

We may as well come directly to the use made of the distinction between natural and moral ability, because its discussion will show the most important limits and uses of human power. It is alleged, by a large class of metaphysick theologians, that *men have natural power to obey all God's commands.* Let us examine this philosophy: and if we can spare a little space, we will also examine its theology. For we hold that the philosophy and theology of this dogma are distinct things, although they may be blended together, and involve each other. But if we examine

the theology of the allegation, we should bring it to the test of what God has said, fairly and philologically interpreted. But we now inquire into its philosophy. How are the facts?

We say the allegation is partly true, or it is utterly false, just as it may be understood. If the meaning be, that men have natural power to do all those things which appropriately belong to their natural ability, then it is true; but these are not all the things which God commands. So that in the form of its statement, it is only true in part. Again, if it mean that men have this kind of power to perform all the duties in which natural power is employed, it is partly true. It is true, that men have just that natural ability, which God requires them to exercise, or the employment of which is involved in obedience to the command. But this affects not the point in controversy. It is not the employment of physical ability which gives moral character to actions: nor is it the province of natural power to effect moral results. If the meaning be, what seems to be the plain construction of the terms of its statement, that men are naturally able to obey all God's commands, it is utterly false in its philosophy, and worse than false in its theology. It is admitted by all, that God's commands are, many of them at least, moral. We know that many external actions, which God commands, men are naturally able to perform. Such are, labouring with their hands, tilling the ground, sowing and reaping, together with many acts of beneficence. But the whole controversy respects natural power to produce moral results; or in more common style, to do that which is exclusively moral. To bring the examination to a point, let us take *love* to God, which is indisputably a moral action of the heart, and which God most peremptorily commands, and examine the application of this philosophical doctrine of natural ability. Have men natural ability to love God? Our opposing philosophy affirms: we deny. Is there any physical power employed in this simple affection of the heart? We answer no; and this brings out the first reason and ground of our denial. It may be connected with the exercise of physical power, and followed by its employment in many ways, but the affection itself is a moral feeling of a moral faculty, and that is its whole philosophical description. There is no physical power in it: and to think of looking for this moral feeling from the exercise of natural power, is no more rational than the attempt to gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles. We stand, therefore, on firm ground in this denial. We show that the philosophical pretension does violence to the principle on which the distinction between natural and moral ability is founded. Take any ground, which the advocates of the distinction may choose, and this application of it to the simple affection of love to God violates that ground. This we fearlessly assert. We have seen, it is true, several, and widely different, reasons of this distinction, and several grounds on which it is maintained; and this application of natural power to loving God is inconsistent with all of them. If men loved God with the hand, or foot, or intellect, or with any thing except their hearts, the case would be different. The fact, that all the faculties of mind and body may be under the influence of love to God as a principle of action, is distinctly admitted; but still, it is incontrovertibly true, that love is an affection of the heart, and belongs exclusively to that faculty.

A second reason of our denial is, that natural power never did

govern, and it never can control, the affections of the heart. They are moral exercises of a moral faculty, and it would be degrading man from his high rank in the workmanship of his Creator, to place his moral character under the control of physical power, in any sense which might be implied in the subjugation affirmed in the philosophy which we oppose. To bring this matter to the test, we appeal to known and common facts, so multiplied and familiar, that we need only make one general statement. It often occurs that men's judgments are convinced that they ought to love certain others whom they dislike, or to dislike others whom they love, but after all their conviction and continued efforts, no change of affection takes place. But we will not spend time in illustrations from analogous facts, which must be familiar to all who will think. Let us examine the case as alleged. And here we ask the advocates of the philosophy, if they have ever seen a man convinced that he ought to love God, filled with agonizing distress at the discovery of his crime in hating God, employing all his time and efforts to change his affections, for days and weeks, without success? During all this time, his whole physical ability has been employed to place the affections on God and Christ, and holy objects, without approximating the change attempted. Will it be alleged that it is because he mistakes, or knows not the proper method of employing his power? Where is the defect? He apprehends his danger and his sin; he believes fully that he must perish, if he love not God; he bends all his intellectual efforts to the investigation of God's character and truth; he seeks instruction from those skilled in the direction of sinners to Christ; and, after all, he remains, by the evidence of his own consciousness, unreconciled to God. He does, externally, the same things to great extent, which those do, who love God; and he gives evidence that his intellect is employed about the same subjects. Could his volition change the character of his affections, he is sure it would be done without delay. Where is the defect? There is inducement enough present to his mind; but after all, no love springs up in his heart. The truth is, the defect is not in the employment of his natural ability; the difficulty lies in the temper of his heart, which all his physical power can never control.

Again, we ask these philosophers if they are acquainted with the mental exercises called the Christian warfare within. If so, will they explain, on their principles, the facts, over which they lament with an apostle—"a law in their members warring against the law of their mind, and bringing them into captivity to the law of sin?" Why are not Christians as holy as they desire to be? If they have natural power to perform all that God commands, why do they not at least love him as much as he requires? The fact is most evident that the hearts of Christians have remaining propensities to evil, and these constitute the controlling "law of sin," to which they are captivated, and by which their natural ability is often directed.

We have many reasons for denying the allegation, which has been so popular with a certain class of theologians: but we have not space to illustrate them. We have stated two, which present the philosophical facts and principles contravened by the dogma. These might be presented in different forms, and lead us to several inferences. We make two or three inferences, from the principle involved in the use made of natural ability in the statement which we oppose. Of course we do not as-

cribe our inferences to those who hold and preach the dogma; but they are inferences which we could not avoid, if we admitted the principle. If it were a law of mental operation that the affections obey the volition; or which is the same thing, were under the control of physical ability, there would be no pain or mental suffering in the world. All men would be happy, no matter what objects might be presented, what disappointments might occur, or what calamities might befall them: they would only have to choose to be pleased with what is called calamity, or disappointment, and they would be happy.

Again, men might always possess just such characters as they choose; be just as penitent, humble, devout and holy as they choose, without the mission or agency of the Holy Spirit. The whole plan of salvation by Jesus Christ, and the mission of the Holy Comforter, would be unnecessary. In short, we see not how, according to this law of mind, any man could be punished in a future state, though he should be cast into outer darkness; let him choose to delight in what the Scriptures call torment, and his happiness would be complete for ever. To us these seem legitimate inferences from the principle, and may be included in the reasons why we deny the statement.

What then, it may well be asked, is the use of this famous distinction between natural and moral ability? Before we reply to this question, upon our own principles of philosophy, we beg leave to state some of the uses which we think it actually subserves, as employed by those to whom we alluded in the statement above. One purpose which it evidently subserves, whether so intended or not, is to make ignorant and undiscriminating hearers think the preacher very wise, while they profess not to understand the distinctions. We have seen such hearers gape with astonishment, while they listened to those metaphysical distinctions; and when they left the place of preaching, we have heard them say, the preacher must be a very learned man, he seems to be familiar with things which we do not understand at all. We leave others to estimate the value of this result. Another effect is produced on many thinking minds, by the manner in which the terms natural ability are used by many preachers; they conclude there is some real contradiction in the revelation of God, to conceal which, the preacher resorts to metaphysical philosophy. But these are comparatively harmless effects, when some others are considered. It misleads multitudes in estimating their character, danger and duty. They perceive, what is true, that they have power, which they are told is physical, to perform the common actions of social life; and that they cannot be held responsible for the exertion of power which they do not possess. This becomes a maxim of extensive application; and because it is true in its legitimate application, they think the more confidently that it bears them out, in estimating their natural ability as fully competent to perform all that God requires. An inference from this strain of argument is practically felt and acted on, to a fearful extent, which leads them to think they have little need of a Saviour, and less need of the Holy Spirit's influence. They cannot, therefore, be very criminal, and are in no danger but what it is in their power, at any time, to avoid. Men will think, under the influence of this philosophy, that their intentions are very good: they may have committed some mistakes, which they are abundantly able to correct and avoid in future. They may be told, and told truly, that it is their duty to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ at once: to this they may assent, but

as they have power to perform these duties at any time, they feel not the urgency of the obligation, and rely upon their own ability to secure the boon, whenever they shall choose. We do not say this is the instruction given them, but we do affirm, that such is the use; or, if it better please a certain class of teachers, the abuse of such philosophy. By the way, the abuse is not so great as many apprehend; nor is it so great an abuse of their preaching, as is their abuse of the doctrine of power. The abuse to which we allude is this: after dividing man's power into natural and moral, they represent him as capable of accomplishing, with one division, that which appropriately belongs to the other; and that which God requires to be performed by both. It is not at all strange that such a perversion of true philosophy, should be followed by greater aberrations from truth.

There are some other evils connected with the use of this philosophy; but our intention is, in a subsequent article, to examine, more at length, the different parts of this system, misnamed philosophy. We have only room to say here, that the advocates of the pretended improvement in mental science tell us, that it subserves an important purpose in bringing men to a consciousness of their responsibility. They set out with the principle, that men are not bound to do what they have not power to perform; or in other words, man's ability is the measure of his responsibility. Hence the necessity of the distinction between natural and moral power. Men must have natural power to perform all that God commands, or the commands are unjust. This, if we do not mistake, is a candid statement of the principle, in its most plausible form. But plausible as it may seem, we think it unsound. Physical ability is not the measure of man's responsibleness to God, because he owes to his Maker feelings which involve no such ability. The highest act of obedience is love, is moral, and proceeds exclusively from a moral source. The plausibility of the statement consists, in the truth of its application to those actions which are appropriate to natural ability; and its fallacy in its application to feelings of the heart, in which there is no employment of natural power. There is still another fallacy; it implies that all moral good and evil belongs exclusively to volition. This is sometimes considered as an inference from the maxim above stated; but by some it is considered as a primary principle, and the doctrine of responsibleness, measured by power, derived from the voluntary nature of all that is moral. It is immaterial whether one or the other be primary or inferential, both principles are involved. We have not room, in the present article, to pursue this topick. In our next number we hope to set this matter in its proper light.

F.

(*To be continued.*)

MODERN MIRACLES, AND PHRENOLOGICAL INTERPRETATIONS.

A series of extended and very interesting papers has lately appeared in the Christian Observer; and was still to be continued, when the number of that work from which we have made the following extract was published—The papers bear the title of "A Visit to a Cathedral." The erudite and elegant writer of these papers, makes the historical recollections, awakened by the monuments of antiquity in the cathedral church of Winchester, the starting point of a variety of religious, moral, and literary observations, of much interest and considerable instruction.

Among the rest, we find the following discussion on the subjects of modern miracles, and the science of Craniology. In regard to the former, we think it of some importance to the whole religious publick, to know the wonderful effects which *excitement* may produce on the human frame. This knowledge is useful and necessary, in order to judge correctly of many religious appearances, beside the pretension to miracles—It is the source and fountain of all fanaticism. As to Craniology or Phrenology, we have always thought it was only fit to be laughed at; and this writer treats it according to its merits.

—

"So much, at present, my dear friend, for Wintonensian cardinals and popish saints. Most of these alleged saints in Winchester, as elsewhere, were in their day great workers of miracles, if we may believe the distich which was inscribed on 'the Holy Hole,' where reposed their mortal relics:

Corpora sanctorum sunt hic in pace sepulta,
Ex meritis quorum fulgent miracula multa.

"Papists have always maintained the uninterrupted succession of miracles in their church, and have urged, in proof of the unscriptural character of Protestantism, that it cannot boast of this mark of divine approbation. The general, and I think the fair and scriptural, reply has been, that miracles are no test of a true church; that there is no promise of their continuance, or any necessity for their continuance, at the present moment; and that the alleged miracles of the Church of Rome are either impostures, or mere contingencies, or to be accounted for by natural causes. Recently, however, a sect has arisen among us, the members of which assert that miracles have never ceased, that they are in visible action now, and that Protestantism claims her full share of them. In proof of these positions, alleged miracles, old and new, have been brought forward; and, in particular, several recent cases of remarkable cures, which, it is stated, have been wrought supernaturally by a lively faith in Christ, and in answer to fervent prayer. The facts and discussions which have taken place on the subject, appear to me to have opened a new chapter in the spiritual and physiological history of our species. It was formerly the habit of writers, either to deny such alleged extraordinary facts, or to feel themselves called upon to admit the inference of miraculous interposition. In this respect, the Church of Rome has been too hardly dealt with; and some of her alleged miracles have been attributed to imposture, where not a shadow of candid reason existed for such an inference. I need not go beyond Winchester for an apposite example; for Bishop Milner, the well-known Roman Catholick historian and antiquary of that place, published, in 1805, a pamphlet entitled 'Authentick Documents of the Miraculous Cure of W. White, July 25th, 1805;' in alluding to which he says, 'I have daily evidence before my eyes of a cure as supernatural and sudden as any upon record.' The usual Protestant reply to such allegations has been, What juggling and mendacious impostors are these Papists! And lamentably true is the charge, in innumerable instances; as, for example, the liquefaction of the blood of Januarius, which no Papist of common understanding but must see to be a trick of priestcraft. But this, I am persuaded, was not a fair reply, in such cases as that alluded to by Bishop Milner, or in those Roman Catholick cases mentioned in the pamphlet entitled 'Documents on the Cure of Miss Fancourt.' The reply was unphi-

losophical, and arose from not knowing the vast surface over which cures of this nature may extend; and the Roman Catholicks had just cause to be displeased, that Protestants viewed all such cases as fraudulent, and refused to listen to the most solemn attestations of their authenticity.

"Now the late discussions, as I have said, have assisted to open up the truth on this interesting question. It is now generally admitted, by well-judging persons, who have not the slightest belief in modern miracles, that such extraordinary cures have again and again taken place; but they generalize the principle of them, and show that this undoubted fact is not confined to any one sect or nation; that cases of this extraordinary character are to be found among Papists and Protestants; nay, among Pagans and Mohammedans. They therefore trace them to some general principle, not of necessity connected with doctrinal faith, or the personal piety of the individual. The Protestant advocates for modern miracles are divided upon the subject: some are so perfectly convinced of the analogy which has been traced between the Protestant cases which have recently occurred, and similar ones in the Church of Rome, that they have admitted that the Popish cases were good miracles, wrought through faith in the common Saviour, and have embraced the Church of Rome as an auxiliary against those of their fellow Protestants who are not convinced that miracles were intended to be perpetual in the church. These advocates for modern miracles act fairly and consistently; but some of their brethren, shocked that the Church of Rome should be allowed as good miracles as our own, deny the former, while they admit the latter; and were much offended with the Christian Observer for pointing out the analogy, and placing the cure of Miss Stuart, or the cures effected by Hohenlohe, side by side with the recent cures among ourselves. But, though they have been much displeased at this juxta-position, they have not attempted to show in what way the analogy failed; or to account for the Roman Catholick cures, while they vindicated the exclusive miraculousness of the Protestant. Their only reply was, that it was impious to think for a moment that there could be any parallel between the Protestant case and the Catholick; between the healing of a pious Scotchwoman, and that of an Irish idolater. But such a reply could convince no person; and it seems to have been tacitly abandoned by all the writers on the subject, who begin to acknowledge that there is no reason why the Church of Rome should be excluded in this question; but, on the contrary, say the vouchers for the miraculous nature of the present dispensation, the attestation of that church is a standing testimony to the truth of the doctrine.

"A new chapter, I said, had been opened by these facts and discussions upon the physical and spiritual parts of our nature; for neither divines nor physicians, I am persuaded, were fully aware of the extent to which the principle of *excitement* might be carried. Its efficacy generally they knew and acknowledged, but they had so little practical experience on the subject, that they were not aware of its latitude. Cases of alleged modern miraculous cures were encountered with strong symptoms of incredulity as to the actual facts: there was deception, it was said, or mistake, in the matter; and if the circumstance happened within the precincts of the Church of Rome, then there was one ready answer, Oh, it is all a Popish juggle. But recent exam-

ples prove that such facts may and do exist; that they are not of necessity juggles, though some of them may be so, impostors taking advantage of truth, to imitate it for interested purposes. For myself, I do not deny the facts of the Winchester case of W. White, or the late Scotch cases, or the cases attested by Mr. Irving, or the Morning Watch, or other post-apostolical cases which I could produce from the pages of history; but it appears to me most indubitable, that they may be all traced to one cause, call it excitement, or what we will; and that this cause is more powerful, and more contagious, (if I may so speak) and applicable to more diseases, than either divines or physicians have generally suspected: in a word, that our ignorance of what was within the rule of God's ordinary laws, has led persons either to deny facts because they could not account for them, or to make miracles because they saw the facts and did not understand the solution.

"There is one remarkable circumstance, which I could respectfully wish the advocates for modern miracles impartially to consider—namely, that the only subject upon which these recent alleged miracles have been wrought, is that most sensitive and complicated fabrick, the living human frame, and chiefly in the case of women. I do not at least recollect an instance of any alleged miraculous cures, in the case of an individual of the less susceptible sex. Now this appears to me very much to favour the doctrine of excitement. In no one of these modern cases is the alleged miraculous action carried beyond the frame of the recipient; in no one has it occurred, that a supposed miracle has been wrought, except in connexion with the operation of mind upon a living body. One miracle is as easy as another to Omnipotence; and, accordingly, we find in the Bible narratives, not only miracles of healing (which, however, stand on totally different grounds to these alleged modern miracles), but effects produced upon dead, and irrational, and inorganick matter. An ass spake, the sun stood still, the shadow on the dial went back, the sea was quelled, the dead were raised. In none of these cases could excitement produce such an effect; for there was no mind, no basis for excitement: but in all the modern instances mind has acted upon body; there is not one case that can be taken out of this range; and though the extent to which the effect may have occurred, is perhaps greater than many persons might have conceived possible, yet every case is but a magnified illustration of the comon adage, that 'conceit can kill and conceit can cure.'

"The whole, I say, of these cases, come under the peculiar and ill-understood phenomena of the action of mind upon the living body. I know of none of these alleged miracles which go beyond a profession of speaking unknown tongues, or bodily healing. The former is, I fear, so direct a result of mental disorder, so clear a case of over-excitement of mind, fitter for a physician than a divine, that I should feel pain to dwell upon it: I can only heartily pity the victim. The latter, in all its modifications, still involves the same principle of the effect of mind upon body. I am not ashamed to say, that some of these effects are more powerful than I had conceived likely, perhaps, or possible; so that I can now receive, and account for, many of the facts in the church of Rome, which before I thought incredible. I can believe Hohenlohism, just as I believe Irvingism. In order to make a distinction between the class of cases which it is supposed

mind might operate on, and those which it could not affect, it has been attempted to draw a clear line between functional and organick disorder; but it is very possible that the physiologist may find that he has presumed too far, upon his supposed knowledge of the workings of the human frame, so fearfully and wonderfully made; that his definitions of what constitutes these two classes of case have not been sufficiently established; and that some diseases may possibly be cured by the operation of mind, which he might have been disposed to consider as not capable of being thus affected. But, be this as it may, the general position is the same: it is mind upon body; the etherial principle on the living fibre: and till our asserters of modern miracles will bring me a case out of this range, I shall not suppose a miracle, though I may be unable to account for the facts; as I cannot tell how my own mind guides my pen, or dictates to my tongue, though I am sure that it does so. I put it to our friends, seriously to ask why they have no one modern instance, to produce of alleged miraculous effects upon matter not connected with mind; upon a dead body, for example. Some persons, it is said, lately tried to raise one in Scotland, but they failed, as might be expected; for the exciting mind, the enthusiastick impulse, actuating the material frame, was wanting. In general, the cures effected have been, obviously, cases connected with the nervous system. I am not aware of any one clearly out of even this limited range. But, grant, that, in the enthusiasm which prevails in certain quarters, one apparently anomalous should occur, it would only convince me that the action of the soul on the body may be more powerful than I had anticipated; that strong nervous influences may affect cases hitherto considered beyond their reach, but still within the sphere of the operation of the mind upon the body. Give me a case beyond this category, and I shall feel staggered. If it were said, that Mr. Irving, to prove his doctrine, had hurled a stone of a hundred pounds weight over the pinnacles of the Caledonian chapel, I should doubt the fact; but if it were irrefragably attested, I should still see no miracle, as I have seen Belzoni perform wonderful feats of strength, and I am not assured how far muscular energy, under very extraordinary excitement might be carried. It is still a case of the mind influencing the bodily organs, stimulating the nerves, and stringing every muscle and fibre to action. But if he moved but a pebble in my garden, while he himself was several miles off; if he turned back the shadow on the sundial, or clave the sea, or raised the dead, or healed another who is unconscious of his operations, the miracle would be obvious. What I wish in these remarks, is simply to suggest the turning fact,—that all the cases referred to as proofs of modern miracles, are cases of an excited mind operating upon a person's own body. In some of these cases the excitement happens to be connected with certain theological opinions, whether those now inculcated by Mr. Boys, Mr. M'Neile, and Mr. Erskine, or those current in the church of Rome, or any other modification of sentiment; but in others the excitement has nothing to do with matters of religious faith, but is wholly secular. How then, in fairness, can the cases be separated, so as to make a miracle in the one and not in the other?

"For my own part, my dear friend, I feel no desire to suppose myself living in an age of miracles. Far more consoling is it to my spirit, to know that I am under the unceasing guidance of Him who is full of kindness and full of

care; who is infinite in wisdom, and in power, and in love. He can now, as ever, work miracles. I doubt not his Almighty energy; neither do I doubt that, if it were according to his blessed will in the present era of the dispensation under which he has mercifully placed us, he would renew the gifts of healing, the speaking with tongues, or the raising of the dead; but I see nothing in Scripture or in experience to lead me to the conclusion that such is the actual fact. In me, therefore, it would not be faith, but presumption, to look for miraculous healing, as much as it would be to look for a miraculous supply of food and raiment. These things have been, and if necessary they will, without doubt, be again. No, we may not limit the Holy One of Israel; but we have no right to go beyond the sphere and economy in which he has evidently placed us, to look for a renewal of miraculous manifestations, which, however gratifying to our self-importance, would not in the least conduce to our salvation.

"I forgot to notice just now, when writing of Cardinal Beaufort, that his skull is said to have been discovered at St. Albans, in the year 1701, and is still somewhere in preservation. I have not the account at hand; but I must presume that the identity of the specimen was properly ascertained at the time: though, in truth, such researches are not always very satisfactory; for, besides the want of printed records, and the mutilations and fragility of non-duplicate parchments, and the dilapidation of monumental inscriptions, the mortal remains of celebrated men, in former days, often underwent many migrations;—their tomb being here, their shrine there, and perhaps their chauntry elsewhere; their body in the Holy Land, their head in York, and their heart at Canterbury; their bones, real or supposititious, dug up ages after their death, enshrined in distant cenotaphs, or perhaps scattered as relics through a score of churches and monasteries; with twenty authentick faith-inspiring radii and ulnæ of one much-esteemed individual, and his inestimable molars and incisors by the hundred, throughout all the nunneries of Europe. However, this invaluable Beaufort skull has been lately consigned to a mould of plaster of Paris, for the benefit of modern cranioscopists; and so it is, that a learned paper has been read over it before the London Prenological Society, in which the lecturer, waxing warm with his subject, magnificently exclaims,—"It is left to phrenology to establish the degree of dependence to be placed upon the assertions of historians!" Now, I have heard several mothers say that they educate their children with much scientifick precision by craniosophy; and a few clergymen, that they preach by it; and a phrenological journal has undertaken in a very grave and religious manner to explain the seventh of the Romans, on the principle that St. Paul had opposing organs—the conscientious bumps saying one thing, and the wicked bumps another, so that he had no rest between them;—and Spurzheim's friend, Mr. Bailey, has lately published sixty skulls as samples of the art, respecting which specimens we find such pithy remarks as the following: 'No. —; a head in whose cerebral organization the Christian law is written:'—so that this man, who, for aught I know, was a heathen or a profligate, was a true Christian and a spiritually-minded man by anticipation: he needed not Bible or sacraments, repentance or faith, a Saviour or a Sanctifier; for the Christian law was already engraved on his brain by nature, and showed itself by ossific protrusions. All this I knew, and much more; nay, that some

amateur has begun to regulate infant schools by 'the science;' but I was not aware that historical fact was to be submitted to this ordeal, and remodelled according to the notions of physiological grave-diggers. But so it is; for tradition, history, and, above all, Shakspeare, we are told, have mistaken poor Cardinal Beaufort's character: there is little 'dependence to be placed upon the assertions of historians!' for thus run his manifestations: 'Head large; the intellectual organs exceedingly well developed; yet others still more so, especially amativeness, love of approbation, self-esteem, combativeness; but almost unprecedented for destructiveness, firmness, and secretiveness.' It is well for the reputation of Phrenology that the Christian law was not written in his skull, since it would have required a large displacement of history, to prove that it was exhibited in his life. I cannot, my friend, but think there is much evil in these reveries. I, indeed, see nothing abstractedly impossible in the idea that different portions of the brain may be connected with different parts of its actual exhibitions; but I do not think that even this has been proved by fact; and, above all, it is most rash, to say the least, to attempt to educate youth, or to recast history, or to interpret scripture, upon so vague a speculation.

"But it is time to emerge from the crypts of cardinals, and the 'Holy Hole' of Popish wonder-working saints, to fresh air and daylight."

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

No. X.

In our third number, speaking of the committee to which was assigned the nomination of a new Board of Missions, we say:—

"Yet on this committee, which was a large one, not an individual was placed, who was likely to act the part of a friend and advocate of the inculpated board—the board of the preceding year. Whether the committee on the case of Mr. Barnes had not proved sufficiently subservient to the wishes of the moderator and the majority of the house, or from whatever other motive the nomination was made, is unknown to us; but so it was, this most important committee was entirely composed of those who were disposed to report, and actually did report, a nomination of a new board, most decidedly friendly to the American Home Missionary Society, and hostile to the existing Board of the General Assembly. A few, and but a few of the members of the existing board, were not displaced—on the expectation, we doubt not, that they would voluntarily resign; as we are confident they would have done, when they should see the complexion of the board entirely changed, and rendered subservient to the American Home Missionary Society."

There are two points in this statement, on which we are at issue with the Moderator. The first is our assertion that "on this committee, which was a large one, not an individual was placed who was likely to act the part of a friend and advocate of the inculpated board—the board of the preceding year." We have already adverted to an apprehended error that we had made, in relation to this point; of the readiness we felt to correct it, as publickly as it had been made; and of our eventual discovery that we had committed no error at all; inasmuch as every member of the committee in question, had shown his feelings toward the old board, by his vote on a previous question. The facts of the case may be seen, summarily, by the following extracts (pp. 183, 184) from the printed minutes of the Assembly. "A motion was made, that in conformity to usage, or to the course pursued last year, a committee of nomination be appointed, to nominate persons to constitute the Board of Missions for the ensuing year. A motion

was then made to postpone this motion, with a view to take up the following, viz.—Resolved, that the present Board of Missions be reappointed. After considerable discussion the vote was taken; and the yeas and nays being called for, the vote stood as follows, viz." &c. Here the names of all the voters are given—The yeas 87, the nays 109. And of course—"The motion for postponement was declared to be lost." This was on the morning of the 1st of June. In the afternoon of the same day, the minutes state—"The motion to appoint a committee to nominate persons to constitute the Board of Missions for the ensuing year was resumed; when it was resolved to appoint such a committee. Dr. Hillyer, Mr. Riddle, Mr. Chase, Mr. Bronson, Mr. Garrison, Mr. Jessup, and Mr. W. Anderson, were appointed."

The discussion which ensued, first on the motion to appoint a committee to nominate a new board, and afterward, on the motion for a postponement of that motion, in order to reappoint the old board, was ardent and considerably protracted. It brought out the sentiments of the opposite parties fully; and as we stated in our last number, those who voted against the postponement expressed their wish to change the old board, "as clearly as if this had been the formal object of their vote." If the motion for postponement had been made, without clearly expressing its design, we admit that it would not, in itself, have been a test of the views and feelings of the members, in relation to the reappointment of the old board. But when the whole design of the motion for postponement was explicitly declared in writing, to be the introduction of a resolution "that the present Board of Missions be reappointed"—to vote, in these circumstances, against the postponement, was virtually a declaration, by every member who so voted, that *he would not so much as consider* a proposition to reappoint the old board—This, we think, is undeniable. Now, when the Moderator made his selection of members to constitute this nominating committee, he took every man of that committee from the nays, on the question of postponement; that is, every man of the committee was selected from those who had voted against even considering a proposition to reappoint the old board. Yet he says, "The committee appointed to nominate a Board of Missions was, in every respect, a fair and discreet committee." We maintain the contrary. For although it was decided that a new Board should be appointed, yet, agreeably to all correct usage, the minority—and especially a minority of no less than 87 voters, when the majority was only 22—ought to have had, on a committee of seven, at least two members. But it had not one; and yet this is affirmed by the Moderator to have been "a fair and discreet committee!" If it was, we cannot tell how an unfair or indiscreet committee could be appointed. Was it *likely*—for this is the single point on which the truth of our statement turns—was it likely that *a friend and advocate* of the inculpated board, would be found on this committee? We have said that *it was not likely;* and let the impartial decide between our statement and that of the Moderator. The Moderator asks, "Did not Dr. Green know that the Rev. Mr. Bronson, a member of this committee, was one of their own missionaries?" We answer, that Dr. Green knows full well, that although the Board of Missions to which he belongs, has been opprobriously represented as composed of *exclusionists*, they have, in more instances than one, appointed men as missionaries, who they had good reason to

believe were not friendly either to them or their operations; and he knows too, that Mr. Bronson's name is among the nays, on the question of postponement. Again; the Moderator asks—"Can the Doctor fix on one act, that shows that Mr. Riddle, of Virginia, entertained any hostility to the Assembly's Board? If so, let him tell us what it is." Well, since the Moderator commands, we will obey, and "*fix on one act*," that, as we think, shows that Mr. Riddle, of Virginia, entertained some hostility to the Assembly's Board. It was this—After the matter had been settled by compromise in the Assembly, or while it was in train for a settlement, Mr. Riddle was an invited guest to a dinner party in Philadelphia; and in a company, of which a member of the old board, with his wife, made a part, Mr. Riddle indulged openly, with great freedom, and at considerable length, in censures of the old Board, as consisting of *exclusives*, as he called them, who ought to be displaced. We have this from the member of the old board who heard it; and who was at length constrained to say something in favour of the Board to which he belonged. Now, we do think that Mr. Riddle, to say the least, was not *likely* to act the part of a friend and advocate of the board which he himself openly and severely inculpated: and yet the Moderator seems to have pitched on him, as that individual of the committee to whom no possible objection could be made. We say then—*Ex uno disce omnes.* Let the man the Moderator has selected, be taken as a sample of the whole committee. Had there been a suitable representation of the minority on this committee, possibly it might have been the means of giving some modification to the report, so as to have lessened its offensive character. But whether it would have had this effect or not, we maintain that the minority had a right to be represented there, and they were not represented; and thus our charge against the Moderator, of unfairness in the appointment of this committee, is fully sustained—and our allegation is strictly verified, that there was not an individual of this committee, who was *likely* to act the part of a friend and advocate of the inculpated board.

The second point to which we have referred in the passage of our third number quoted above, is found in these words—"A few, and but a few, of the members of the existing board, were not displaced—on the expectation, we doubt not, that they would voluntarily resign, as we are confident they would have done, when they should see the complexion of the board entirely changed, and rendered subservient to the American Home Missionary Society." This is the sentence to which we referred in our last number, when we said, that in our statement of facts we had seen nothing to correct, "beyond one verbal inaccuracy—if indeed it be an inaccuracy—no way affecting the substance of our statement." The supposed inaccuracy lies in the clause, "A few, and but a few, of the members of the existing board were not displaced." The Moderator and the Stated Clerk have both affirmed, that it is so far from being true that only a few members of the existing board were not displaced, that a very considerable majority of them were not displaced; and they both have made a statement of numbers to sustain their allegations.

The Stated Clerk, on the 21st of October last, published in the religious newspaper, edited by himself, in reply to an article with the signature "MANY ENQUIRERS," the following paragraph.

"I have examined the original report of the Committee who nominated a Board of

Missions for the year 1831, and I find, that of the 171 persons named on the same, 99 were members of the board for the year 1830, and 72 were not members. These 99 were Dr. Green's '*few* of the existing board that were not displaced;' and they prove to be 'most of the persons who are now members of the board.' If this statement is denied, or doubted, the names of the whole nomination shall be printed in the Philadelphian."

As the numbers given by the Moderator and Clerk are the same, we suppose they have communicated on this subject; or perhaps the Moderator took a copy for his own use. At any rate, they, we believe, are the only depositories of the precious document in question; and hitherto they have chosen to keep it to themselves, although a publick demand has been made on the Stated Clerk to give it publicity. We know not how many have "doubted or denied" the accuracy of his statement; but we are satisfied, that not a few have not merely *doubted*, but *believed*, that if the whole document were fairly published, a use would be made of it which the Stated Clerk wishes should not be made; and that this is the reason for its being withheld. We have looked for its publication, ever since it was demanded; and we were prepared to acknowledge our inaccuracy, if it should appear, by an authentick document, that we really were chargeable with it. We did think it most probable that we had committed a verbal error; and such, on the whole, is our present impression. But we still maintain, and think we shall show, to the satisfaction of every candid reader, that the free admission of this error, does not affect the substance of our statement. The case is this—The entire Board of Missions, consisting, say of 171 members, is formed of some taken from every Synod within the bounds of the General Assembly. This is done out of respect to the several Synods, and in hope that the influential members who are thus placed on the Board, will, as they have opportunity, favour its plans and operations. But of this nominated Board, not a fourth part ever have been, or are ever likely to be, present at any one meeting of the Board. Such of them as happen to be members of the General Assembly, for the current year, attend, if they choose, those meetings of the Board which occur while the Assembly is sitting; and they generally attend the meeting which takes place at the rising of the Assembly, when the officers of the board for the ensuing year, with the executive committee, and the Corresponding Secretary and General Agent, receive their appointments. But only those members of the board who reside in the city of Philadelphia and its vicinity, constitute *the active board through the year*, after the dispersion of the members of the Assembly. This limited board has monthly meetings, at which the minutes of the Executive Committee for the past month are read throughout, for the approval or correction of the board. The board also gives advice and direction to the Executive Committee, in important concerns—In a word, the Committee is under the direction and control of this board; and we do not recollect since the reorganization in 1828, more than about half a dozen members, beyond the limits of Philadelphia and its vicinity, who, at different times, have attended the board at its monthly or special meetings. Now as the whole *real efficiency of the Board of Missions*, after the members of the Assembly leave the city, rests with this board, we confess it engrossed our attention, when we said that "a few, and but a few of the members of the existing board were not displaced;" and such we now fully believe would appear to be the fact, if the report of the nomina-

ting committee were fairly and fully before the publick. We have little doubt that in reference to *the whole nominated board*, there were *more than a few*, who were not displaced; probably because the most of them were such as the nominating Committee knew had opinions and feelings like their own—One excellent man, however, in the western country, was ejected, and one less excellent put in his place; and this drew from a member from Kentucky, who knew the parties, a very earnest and pointed remonstrance. But we still believe, that in regard to *the efficient active board through the year*, "a few, and but a few of the members were not displeased." Till, then, the Stated Clerk shall publish the report of the Nominating Committee, we shall believe that the amount of our error is this—that our language, when applied to the *nominal* board is erroneous; but when, applied to the board which is permanently *efficient*, it is correct. Now, on this inadvertence, in not distinguishing the nominal from the efficient board—for such, and nothing more, it was—the Moderator and Stated Clerk have endeavoured to convict us of falsehood—with a pretty broad intimation that it was *wilful falsehood*. May the God of truth, and an impartial publick, judge between us!

If this report of the Committee of nomination had been published, as we wished and expected it to be, in November last, and it had appeared that we were erroneous, even in regard to the *effective annual board*, we would immediately have confessed and corrected our error—And if the report shall yet be published, and it shall appear that *more than a few* of the effective board were not displaced—meaning by *more than a few*, such a number as not to leave them, in all probable occurrences, a decided minority—then we *now* admit, that we have, in this instance, been in error. But even with this admission, the *substance* of our statement remains perfectly true; and it has been the usual course of our opponents—and it always indicates a bad cause—to fix on some *circumstance*, or some *verbal error*, and by dwelling with apparent triumph on this, to endeavour to hide the real merits of the case entirely from the reader.*

What is the substance of our statement? Let any one attentively read our quotation, and he will see it to be this, that the Nominating Committee "actually did report a nomination of a new board, most decidedly friendly to the American Home Missionary Society, and hostile to the existing board of the General Assem-

* We think the foregoing statement may be useful to the publick, by being given in a more condensed form, as follows.

The General Assembly's Board of Missions may be considered as in fact *three fold*—(1) The entire board, composed of members from every Synod—(2) The board which is formed at the meeting of the Assembly—by some members from a distance, with those of the city and vicinity—(3) The permanent active board, composed of members resident in and near the city. It may be truly said, that the board, viewed under the first of these aspects, *never* acts; that is, it never acts by a majority, or even a fourth part of its numbers—Viewed under the second aspect, the board acts *once a year*, at the meeting of the General Assembly, when the officers of the board, the Executive Committee for the year, and the General Agent and Corresponding Secretary, are appointed—Viewed under the third aspect, the board is efficient *through the year*—meets monthly—and directs and controls the Executive Committee. It was *the manifest purpose* of the New School members in the last Assembly, finding they had a majority, to change the character of the board in *the second and third* of these aspects, where *the whole efficiency* of the board does, in fact, reside—As to the board, viewed under *the first aspect*, they had little solicitude; for in this capacity they knew the board never did and never could act; and, therefore, although the Nominating Committee changed a few individuals, here they could still leave 99 untouched, *without affecting the efficiency of the board in any degree whatever.*

bly;" and that those who were left on the board, (meaning the efficient board of members residing in Philadelphia and its vicinity,) "would voluntarily resign—when they should see the complexion of the board entirely changed, and rendered subservient to the Home Missionary Society;" and that we had "not a doubt, that this was expected by the Nominating Committee and their friends." We certainly knew the state of our own mind, that we had not a doubt as to the expectation mentioned; and we spoke what we well knew to be the fact, when we affirmed that the result we mentioned would have taken place—We knew that the members of the old board who were retained, would never have consented to hold a standing in a board whose measures they disliked, *for no other purpose but the unworthy one of embarrassing the majority, by incessant objections, and abortive attempts at counteraction.* As to the former part of what we have shown was the substance of our statement, its verity is vouched by the well known facts of the case. The whole design of the appointment of the nominating Committee was, to change the existing board, and the nomination did change it most effectually—That the new board, as nominated, was so constituted, that of the members who could be present to vote, in organizing the annual efficient board at the rising of the Assembly, there should be a decided majority "friendly to the H. M. S., and hostile to the existing board of the General Assembly," was the very exciting cause of the confusion which ensued. The Moderator has tried to gainsay our declaration, that "this report was so flagrantly at war with all equity and propriety, that it produced criminations and recriminations, which issued in a complete disregard of the Moderator, and of all order." But deny it whoever may, such was the notorious fact. We have already referred to one instance, mentioned by a member from Kentucky, in which "war was made on all equity and propriety." We will mention one more, and it is one which we stated in the Assembly, at the time of the controversy. A member of the old board, the minister of a large and wealthy congregation, that had then contributed, and is still contributing, very liberally, both to the A. H. M. S., and to the American Board of Education, but had never contributed any thing, as a congregation, and not more than three or four small donations, from perhaps the same number of its individual members, to the Missionary Board of the Assembly—this minister was retained in the new nomination, and on what we have called the efficient board: And another member of the old board, the minister of a congregation in Philadelphia, that had, according to its means, contributed more liberally, both to the Missionary and Education Boards of the Assembly, than any other congregation within its whole bounds—this minister was, in the new nomination, displaced and left out of the board altogether. Now, if, in this contrast of cases, there was not "a war made on all equity and propriety," we wish the Moderator would tell us how such a war can be waged. The truth is, the real friends of the ecclesiastical order and institutions of the Presbyterian church, felt that they were called to contend FOR EXISTENCE, with those who seemed determined to sacrifice them all to voluntary associations, and congregational attachments: and under the blessing of heaven they contended successfully.

We had said in our second number, in a note, that "The Moderator once requested to be allowed to leave the chair and speak to a subject under debate. The re-

quest was opposed, and he withdrew it." In each of these sentences, the Moderator asserts, roundly and repeatedly, that we have said what "*is not true.*" His proof of the falsehood of our first sentence is this—"The Moderator requested the Assembly to answer the following question, "*Is it proper for the* MODERATOR *to take any part in the discussions of this house, by occupying the floor, and placing another person in the chair?*" This question, he says, he reduced to writing, showed it to several members, and has the original still in his possession: And in coming over this point, in the 29th article of his summary, he says, "The editor has represented the Moderator as asking an "indulgence" of the Assembly, when he only requested the Assembly to give an expression of opinion, respecting the *right* of the Moderator; that is, the right of ANY *Moderator*, in the premises stated." Our first remark here is, that the Moderator, in order to brand our statement with falsehood, makes one of his own, which represents him as acting in a far more exceptionable manner, than if he had admitted that he did, precisely what we said he did. That it is orderly for a Moderator, at any time, to ask for himself an indulgence of the house, we believe no one ever denied. But for a Moderator, in his seat, to bring forward and propose for the discussion and decision of the house, an important question *in thesi*, is to usurp the exclusive privilege of the members on the floor. If he wishes such a question to be discussed, he has the common privilege of proposing it to the Committee of Overtures; and if they overture it to the house, it will receive a proper attention. But for the Moderator to bring forward such a question from the chair, is in fact to exercise a power, the lawful exercise of which requires the action, not only of one, but of two deliberating members; for such a question as he affirms he proposed, can never receive the attention of the house, till it has been moved by one member, and seconded by another. Thus the Moderator, in order to fix on us the charge of falsehood, in saying that he asked for an indulgence—which he certainly had a right to ask—maintains that he did what he had clearly no right to do—maintains that, without leave or license, he assumed, in the Moderator's chair, the exclusive privilege of two members on the floor of the house—For he insists that it was a question *in thesi*, that he proposed; or, to use his own words, "he requested the Assembly to give an opinion respecting *the right* of the Moderator; that is, [mark it] the right of ANY *Moderator*, in the premises stated." We really think that our unerring Moderator would better have left this matter on the footing on which we placed it, than to have reiterated the declaration—"it is not true; it is not true." Which is the greater error—to ask a personal indulgence, or, without any asking at all, to usurp the rights of two members on the floor, while sitting in the Moderator's chair? Had the Moderator done so much of this already, that he thought little of doing it on this occasion, or was it done without recollecting what he did?

But the question still returns, was our statement really true or not? We can only say, if our word will stand for any thing, that when we wrote, we did honestly think that what we said was strictly true; and had not so much as a suspicion, till we saw the Moderator's denial, that any mortal living would, or could, question its truth; and we know that a considerable number of others, of whom we have inquired, understood him as asking a personal indulgence; nor have we heard of an indivi-

dual, except the Moderator himself, who understood him otherwise. Nor does the question which he says he wrote and proposed, require any other construction—It was fair to understand it as only a courteous manner of proposing a personal concern; for it will be observed that the question, as it relates to "the right of ANY *Moderator*," is the Doctor's *exposition* of his meaning, when he wrote his vindication, and makes no part of the question which, by his own showing, he proposed to the Assembly. Besides, it is in the recollection of several eye and ear witnesses, that during the short space that this question was before the Assembly, the Doctor did say, "that he thought if he was on the floor, he could throw some important light on the subject under discussion." It was therefore perfectly natural to consider the inquiry as personal to himself. We pretend not to say that the Moderator's views in proposing this subject were not such as he states them to have been—Such they might have been, for aught we know. But we do say, and insist, that we put no forced construction on his words, when led by them to think, as we assuredly did, that he asked a personal indulgence; and hence, that in stating this, we stated no more than what we believed to be sacredly true. But the Moderator also says, that what we have called his *request*, was "not opposed." We certainly thought it was: and if Mr. Robert Breckinridge, of Kentucky, will say that *he* did not oppose it, and very decidedly too, we will confess that, in this particular, we were in error. Till then, we shall place the Moderator's positive assertion on this subject, among his other aberrations.

But Dr. Beman, not content with *vindicating* his conduct as Moderator, goes on to censure that of the editor, when he had the honourably painful office of sitting in the Moderator's chair. It is admitted, in the note already referred to, that the editor, when Moderator, did leave his seat, on one occasion, and speak on the floor of the house; and he will now add that he did so, because this had been A USAGE—for there is nothing in the constitution either allowing or prohibiting it—*a usage* of Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, from the time that he had been a member of any of these ecclesiastical courts, till the time in which he performed the act which the late Moderator thinks was so objectionable. It is admitted, however, that this usage has, of late years, in the General Assembly especially, been gradually becoming obsolete; and the editor well recollects, that although he truly thought at the time, that he was doing nothing objectionable, yet he was surprised and mortified by some remarks that were made on the supposed impropriety of this act, and determined that, by him, it should never be repeated. He had indeed entirely forgotten to whom he was indebted for these remarks; but the publication of Dr. Beman leads him to suppose, that it was from the last Moderator, then on the floor of the house, that he received the favour. We wish to say here, that our ecclesiastical constitution appears to us to be really defective, for the want of some *provision*, to come in place of the *usage* to which we have referred. In deliberative bodies of a civil character, the house, on important occasions, goes into a committee of the whole, when the presiding officer, if he chooses, takes the floor, and gives his fellow members, at as much length as he pleases, the benefit of his views and reasonings. In the Dutch church, which is strictly Presbyterian, their general Synod always choose an *assessor*, when they choose a Moderator; and

whenever the Moderator thinks it proper and important that he should deliver his opinions and arguments, on any topick before the Synod, he calls the assessor to the chair, and mingles in the discussion. Would it not be well for us to imitate our Dutch brethren in this, by making a constitutional provision for the purpose? The Westminster Assembly of divines had two assessors, in addition to their prolocutor.

We next notice the Moderator's reply to our objection to his placing Mr. Bacon, the congregational representative from Connecticut, on the committee to which was referred the case of Mr. Barnes and the Philadelphia Presbytery. After quoting his authorities in detail, the Moderator adds, "From these references, which embrace the period of *ten years*, we learn the uniform and undeviating usage of the Moderators of the General Assembly, in appointing the delegates of corresponding bodies, on the important committees of the house." He subsequently says—"But the editor lays much stress on the circumstance that the Connecticut delegate, by a recent arrangement, had lost all right to a vote in the house. But this is a consideration never regarded by any Moderator of the General Assembly." Now it is true that we did lay "great stress," and as to the matter of right, the whole stress, on the circumstance that the delegate from Connecticut had recently "lost all right to a vote in the house." And if the Moderator had continued his quotation to the end of the sentences from which he garbled it, he would have laid before his readers a reason for the stress we laid on this circumstance, which all his sophistry would not have been able to countervail. We need little more in reply, than to repeat the sentences, without mutilation, as they stand in our third number —"That delegate, (we said) by a recent arrangement, had lost all right to a vote in the house; but whoever is acquainted with the usual course of business knows, that a vote in a committee, on an important and interesting concern, is of more ultimate influence than two votes in the house. Yet here, an individual gives his vote where it has the greater influence, when it is denied him where it has the less." The Moderator attempts no answer to this reasoning, but fills up his paragraph with round assertions, that the distinction we had made "was never regarded by any Assembly, nor by any Moderator;"* and concludes it with representing the editor as a "*culprit*," who had passed sentence on himself, because he, when Moderator, had appointed a delegate from Connecticut, on the Committee of Bills and Overtures. Now, without staying to remark on the courteous language of the Moderator here, we state, that in our judgment, the whole merits of this question centre in the single point—*that the party objected to had no right to a vote in the house;* and we maintain, that by whomsoever men, not having a right to vote in the house, have been placed on

* Dr. Fisk, the Moderator of the Assembly for 1830, has authorized us to state, that he is, and always has been, of our opinion, that since the Connecticut delegation has lost the right of voting in the Assembly, no representative of that delegation ought to be placed on any important committee. With this view of the subject, he said he had filled up the judicial committee of 1830, with Presbyterian members. But before they were announced, the Stated Clerk urged him to place one member on this committee from a corresponding body; and that, without time to deliberate much, he consented, though very reluctantly, to displace one name, and to put in its room that of Rev. Daniel A. Clark, from the General Association of Vermont. Dr. Beman, not content with placing his favourite, Mr. Bacon, on the committee in Mr. Barnes' case, put him also on the Judicial Committee.

important committees, especially on committees to consider questions involving *constitutional principles of the Presbyterian church*—those who have done this, have "made appointments in a high degree improper, if not absolutely unlawful," which are the precise words of our charge against the late Moderator, for his appointment of Mr. Bacon. And for this judgment, we rely on the reason assigned when we made our charge, and which we have repeated above—We offer no other reason; we are confident we need no other. But who sees not, that all the cases mentioned by Dr. Beman, in regard to the Connecticut delegation, antecedently to the year 1830, when the right of that delegation to a vote in our Assembly was surrendered, are just so much of nothing at all to the purpose? Till that period, the Connecticut delegates had a *conventional* right, though we think it was never a *constitutional* right, to *vote*, and did vote, as well as *deliberate*, on all subjects that came before the General Assembly; and therefore we humbly think, that the editor's reasoning does not return on himself, to make him a *culprit*, because he placed a member of this delegation on the Committee of Overtures, in 1824. *Then*, such a member had a conventional right to be there: but at the last General Assembly, Mr. Bacon had no right of any kind, to be where Dr. Beman placed him. The difference, therefore, between *right* and *wrong* is the difference between what the editor did, and what Dr. Beman did: and hence it follows; in the Moderator's dialectick, that the editor is a *culprit*, and that Dr. Beman is *immaculate—Quod erat demonstrandum.*

In the civil community, no subject that comes before a representative body for disposal, is, we believe, ever committed, except to its own members. Other individuals than members may be requested, and may consent, or be summoned, to attend a committee, for the purpose of giving information, or answering inquiries; but to make them members of the committee, is never thought of. But on subjects not involving constitutional principles, or important interests, in the Presbyterian church—such as those that relate to a Bible Society, a Temperance, Tract or Colonization Society, a Sabbath School Union, a Concert of Prayer, or an Association to preserve the Sabbath from desecration—we would never object to any of the delegates from other bodies to the General Assembly being placed on its committees. The subjects mentioned, relate to the general interests of religion, as regarded by almost all denominations of Protestant Christians, and we would not therefore refuse them a representation on the committees of the Assembly. Nor do we object to the usage of referring to a selection of ministers and elders of the Presbyterian church, not members of the existing Assembly, some important subject, to be considered and reported on to the Assembly of the following year. But Mr. Bacon, a Congregationalist, and not entitled to vote in the house, was placed on a committee to which was referred the consideration of several most important constitutional points and principles of the Presbyterian church, both in doctrine and government;—points and principles in relation to which his attachments and habits would naturally lead him to oppose strict Presbyterianism: and that they did so lead him, he, in his published letter to us, openly avows, and boasts of it in a strain of triumph. In his vindication, he pleads that he was placed on the committee by the Moderator, and that he supposed the Moderator knew his own

duty. But we think he also knew —and indeed his letter shows it —that his feelings had already enlisted him decidedly against one of the parties, whose cause was to be decided, if equitably decided, by the standards of the Presbyterian church, and by nothing else. We think, indeed, that the Moderator was far more blame-worthy than he, in this whole transaction; but did he not, after all, consent to act where he might have refused, and where delicacy and propriety should have dictated a refusal? Do not men who are called to a jury in civil causes, and who know that they have prejudged the whole case, often state this frankly to the court, and in consequence are removed from the panel? Was there not, in this trial, in the highest court of the Presbyterian church, so much analogy between the committee on which Mr. Bacon was placed, and a jury in civil courts, that the principles which have influence on those courts, should have had such influence in our ecclesiastical court, as to make Mr. Bacon absolutely decline this appointment? Let an impartial publick decide on these questions, and we have no fear for the award.

We proceed to make a few remarks on the two following positive assertions, in the 10th and 11th articles of the Moderator's summary—"The Allegation of the Advocate that '*a large proportion*' of the Low Church 'approve' of admitting 'mere church members' to a seat in the Assembly, is so far from being correct, that it has not one particle of evidence to support it—The Low Church did '*not vote*' against an act of the last Assembly—as the Advocate says they did—the object of which 'was to prevent committee men and *mere church members*, from hereafter having any claim to seats in the General Assembly—'for no such act was passed or proposed."

A considerable part of the Moderator's seven numbers consists of quibble and evasion; but there is rather a larger portion of them than common in the foregoing affirmations. Let us examine his first assertion, taken in connexion with that part of his second number, of which it is given as an epitome, where he says, "But that '*a large proportion*' of the New School in the last Assembly, expressed in any shape or manner, their approbation of admitting men who are '*merely church members*,' as constituent members of that body, I have yet to learn. Let the editor name one man who uttered such a sentiment, and I consent that this solitary instance shall stand as an apology for this sweeping declaration." Now this surely seems, in the reading, to be not only plausible, but imposing and conclusive. Yet it is, in fact, nothing more than an evasion, serving to keep a just state of the case entirely out of view. The facts are these—Before the election of a Moderator, a question was raised, whether "a standing committee" man should be allowed to vote. In favour of his voting, Dr. Beman was earnest, eloquent and successful—It was determined that the committee man should vote; and no doubt he voted for his advocate. Afterwards, sixty-seven members subscribed a protest against the lawfulness of admitting this man to a seat in the house; and an answer to the protest was ordered, and brought in by the New School members—This we have noticed in a preceding number. Subsequently to the decision of the case of Mr. Barnes, and the settlement of the business in regard to the Board of Missions, so many of the New School members obtained dismissions and left the Assembly, that their opponents were able to carry a resolution, by a majority of 81 to 54, "That in the opinion of the General Assembly, the appoint-

ment of some Presbyteries, as has occurred in a few cases, of members of standing committees to be members of the General Assembly, is inexpedient and of questionable constitutionality, and therefore ought not, in future, to be made." Against this resolution the New School members protested; and assigned as a reason, that "this Assembly, on the first day of its session, when full, did, by a large majority, decide this question, by admitting a member of the Standing Committee to a seat in the house." Here are the facts—And now, because mere church members are not specified in the records, and were not, as we are ready to admit, pleaded for, *under this designation*, by the New School members in debate, we are charged with making a statement, "without one particle of evidence to support it," in saying that "a large proportion" of the Low Church, approved of admitting them to a seat in the Assembly. But there are two undeniable facts, which will show that we had many particles of evidence to bear out the truth and correctness of our statement; and that what the Moderator says, is nothing better than an evasion. The first fact is, that an *unknown* number, yet certainly *a considerable* number, of mere church members have come up to the Assembly, commissioned as ruling elders, and have taken their seats accordingly. One case of this kind is on record, in the minutes of the Assembly for 1826. Nor let it be said, that this is a solitary case. We have evidence, to which, if necessary, we can refer, that two individuals, now ministers of the gospel, and worthy of their office, have stated, since the last meeting of the Assembly, that while they were yet *mere church members*, they came to the Assembly commissioned as ruling elders, and took their seats accordingly. From this, and other indications of a similar kind, there is good reason to believe that this practice has been pretty general, for a number of years past; and that there was a number—although none but themselves can tell what the number was—of mere church members, on the floor of the last General Assembly. Again: It cannot be denied, that all the mere church members who ever came into the Assembly, entered it under cover of "The Plan of Union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the new settlements, adopted in 1801, [See Digest, p. 297] by which it was agreed, that a Committee man "may have the right to sit and act in the Presbytery, as a ruling elder of the Presbyterian church." This right of a committee man to sit in a Presbytery, was construed to extend to the right of such a man to sit also in the General Assembly; and for the equity and propriety of such a construction, the New School men did contend most earnestly, and when they were overruled, they protested as earnestly, against the resolution of the Assembly above recited. Now we ask, if men plead, and vote, and protest, as if their dearest interests were at stake, in favour of an arrangement, through which mere church members have notoriously come into the Assembly, for years in succession, and some of whom, in all probability, were then on the floor of the house—can it be said, because they were not mentioned by name, that in no "shape or manner" there was manifested an "approbation of admitting" them? The New School men would have acted with a stupidity with which we have never charged them, if they had *avowedly* pleaded for the right of mere church members to sit in the Assembly—this would have ruined their cause at once. But it was in their usual course to plead for something more plausible, which they knew would quite

as effectually secure their object—would leave the door wide open, as for years in succession it had been left, for the admission of as many mere church members as they and their Presbyteries should choose to commission as ruling elders. In this way, accordingly, the New School men did make every exertion that their ingenuity could devise; and we did them no injustice, in representing this, as showing their approbation of the admission of mere church members into the Assembly. Who can say, without an evasion, that those who did all in their power to defeat the only measure that could keep them out of the Assembly, did not manifest plainly a willingness and desire that they should come into the Assembly? Here is the point without disguise; and let every reader decide it for himself. But the Moderator says again, that no act was passed to keep mere church members out of the Assembly. Here is just another quibble—That is, because no act was passed, that mentioned mere church members by name, it may be asserted that no act was passed to keep them out; although an act was passed which had for a principal object, in the minds of those who voted for it, the effectual keeping of them out. If committee men were to be excluded, the Old School men knew, that mere church members, would inevitably be excluded—And to exclude them effectually and forever, was, we repeat, one chief object of the resolution.—O for an antagonist, if we must have one, who will not mystify the point in issue, by a play upon words, or by pleading the want of certain words, when the matter intended is as clear as a sunbeam.

We thought we were prepared not to be surprised at any thing the Moderator could utter; but we had not duly estimated Dr. Beman's *astonishing* powers. We confess the following language did surprise us.

"Just as the question, on commitment, in the case of Mr. Barnes, was to be taken, Dr. Green commenced certain remarks, which had a bearing on the mode of appointing the committee in question; and which led the Moderator to call him to order; and Dr. Ely, one of the complainants, to observe, that if the Committee of Reference were not appointed in the usual way, that is, by the chair, the case would not be referred. Dr. Green acquiesced; but as soon as the question was decided in favour of referring the case, and the house had ordered that the committee should consist of *eleven* members, the Doctor handed me a slip of paper, containing five names (not quite *half* the number of the whole committee), and remarked very pleasantly, 'If you will put these on, I care not who the others are.'"

Now, before we offer one word of comment, we ask any impartial person, and especially those who have been frequently in the Assembly, where was the *criminality* of what the Moderator says was done on this occasion by Dr. Green? Yet the Moderator insinuates, that here was an "attempt, secretly to touch the very main spring of motion, by endeavouring to make an interest with the Moderator, and through him to secure some additional weight in the committee, in favour of his side of the question." And in recurring to this matter in his summary he says—

"The interference of Dr. Green, in *trying* SECRETLY *to influence the Moderator*, in the appointment of the committee, in the case of Mr. Barnes, accounts for all his conscientious difficulties in relation to the appointment of Mr. Bacon on that committee; and at the same time tells somewhat worse in the publick ear, than the tale, that the Moderator acted, in this instance, as all other moderators have done before him. And this interference of Dr. Green, is known, both to High Church and Low Church, to be in perfect keeping with that uniform *prompter-ship;* which he has exercised toward Moderators of the General Assembly, ever since the Assembly was constituted."

We have given the Moderator's language thus extensively, because

we greatly mistake, if it does not exhibit a spirit in the writer, that will prove an effectual antidote to the mischief he intended to effect. It is not for us to tell how any honourable man, any man of conscious integrity, any man that feels himself incapable of base design and sinister action, could have put the construction which the Moderator did, on what he says was said and done by us, on the occasion to which he adverts. We shall not make a long defence. The whole occurrence to which he refers had completely passed from our mind, till we read his review; nor can we now say that we recollect the half of what he affirms took place: we could not, if our life depended on it, tell, otherwise than by conjecture, a single name that was on the paper which he says we presented to him. But let his statement stand for an accurate exhibition of facts: and then Dr. Green declares most unequivocally, that if he ever performed an innocent action in his life, and one too of very little importance, he thought he did so, when he handed the paper and uttered the words, which the Moderator affirms that he handed and uttered. What he did he knew was of the same character with what had been done in scores of instances, without any suspicion, ever known to him, of an attempt to corrupt the Moderator, or to use any improper influence with him. It has always been perfectly understood, that the Moderator would use his own judgment in appointing committees, whatever suggestions might be made by others—and hence suggestions have been often and freely made. Hence Moderators themselves have often solicited them—The writer certainly did it, when he was in the chair; and a member of the last Assembly told us, a few days since, that Dr. Beman wished and even urged him to nominate a part, or the whole, of a committee. But I would not, said the member, for I knew him too well. Dr. Green did not know him so well then as he knows him now, or he too would have been on his guard. But he did know him well enough then, not, consciously, to do even a questionable act in his presence. For the same reason that Dr. Green would not put his head in a lion's mouth, he would not then, or now, knowingly, put it in Dr. Beman's power to stain his character. But in the alleged transaction, he had no conception that what he did was capable of any construction to his disadvantage. If he had done, what was done by the Moderator's friend, the Stated Clerk, and when not a member of the house—if, after the Moderator had formed a committee, and written down the name of every member, he had urged the Moderator to withdraw one name, and to insert another, there might have been some colour for the charge of obtrusive interference; but even in this case, a corrupt motive ought not to be imputed. But what Dr. Green did, was only what he verily believes has been done, as to the substance of the thing, at every General Assembly that has met for many years past; and done without any imputation of a sinister design. But then it is to be remembered, that the Assembly never before had such a Moderator as it had at the last meeting—May it never have such another!—As to what the Moderator has thrown out about *promptership*, we have only to say, that if Dr. Green, in his whole life, has prompted Moderators half as much as Dr. Beman, from the Moderator's chair, prompted his friends on the floor of the house, at the last Assembly, it must be acknowledged that Dr. Green has done a very improper thing—But this he does not admit.

We have now done with Dr.

Beman, at least for the present; and we sincerely wish, and we suspect our readers wish it too, that we may never have occasion to mention his name again. It would not have appeared, as it has done, in our pages, if it had not been necessary to characterize the majority of the last Assembly. But in his person, they elevated Murdockism and Finnyism to the Moderator's chair, and his conduct in the chair had their approval; and hence what he was and did, seems necessary to be told, in giving a true view of the present state of the Presbyterian church. Yet—we speak it reverently—God forbid that we should hate this man, or wish him any evil—We have solemnly charged our heart, in reliance on divine aid, not to do it. To defend the church, and to defend ourselves, we have thought it right—and after many and serious reviews, we still think it right—that his misdeeds should be exposed. But he has had, and with the Lord's help, he shall still have, our poor but sincere prayers, that he may be forgiven—that he may see, repent of, and forsake his errors; and that, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, he may obtain eternal life.

In the whole series of essays, of which this is the last, we have, if we know our own heart at all, been influenced by a sincere desire, to serve, in the best manner we could, the church in which we were born and educated, in which we have ministered in the gospel of Christ for five-and-forty years; and whose interests and prosperity—indissolubly connected with its purity and peace—ought to be dearer to us than life itself. We knew, when we commenced this series of papers, that we should probably draw on ourselves the vituperations of those whom we opposed; and they have not disappointed us. They have done all in their power to destroy our character, and with it, the little influence which by a long life spent in serving, or at least in trying to serve, the Presbyterian church, we had, by the blessing of God, obtained. What success they have had, time will disclose. But in the mean time, we are willing they should know, and we wish our friends to know, that they have not greatly disturbed our personal peace. Our covenant God has sustained us, and a good conscience before Him has comforted and cheered us. If now and then a poisoned arrow has annoyed us a little, it has made no lasting or very troublesome wound. The holy oracle says, "if ye suffer for righteousness sake, happy are ye." Our experience has verified the oracle—We have been truly happy, and for us peculiarly so, amidst all the calumny that has been heaped upon us. Blessed God and Saviour! to Thee the praise is wholly due, and to Thee we would humbly ascribe it all.

What is yet in reserve for the Presbyterian church, we know not. In its present state, it is palpably evident, it cannot long remain. The next General Assembly will probably decide, whether its existing organization can continue. —We hope that every true friend of the church will be at his post. Plans are proposed for a new organization, which seem to us to militate irreconcilably with the vital principles of Presbyterianism. We know not how much, or how little countenance, these plans are likely to receive. For ourselves, we protest against them. We are in favour of every degree of accommodation with our brethren, which will consist with a sacred regard to our publick Standards, both doctrinal and governmental, as they now stand; and with a return to the exercise of discipline in our church, agreeably to the tenour and provisions of those Standards. To any thing short of this, we cannot in conscience agree; and we are prepared to

take our lot, whatever it may be, with those, be they few or many, who are of this mind. We hope there will be much and fervent prayer for the divine guidance of the Assembly, in all the deliberations and decisions of the coming session. And we do cherish an humble hope that a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, the God of our fathers, and of his people in every age, will hear in mercy; and yet interpose for the preservation of our beloved church, in the full integrity of its scriptural creed and ecclesiastical order.

THE WIND.

BY A LADY OF UNION TOWN, PA.

Ps. cxlviii. 8. *Stormy wind fulfilling his word.*

Wind, stormy wind, whither goest thou,
In thy reckless speed and might;
Come rest in this valley so warm and low,
And sleep off thy terrors to-night.

And the wind seemed to answer, "I travel in haste
At the high behest of the Lord;
Rest, mortal, rest, if indeed thou may'st,
But I must fulfil his word!"

And it "blew where it listed," careering abroad,
With the tempest's ardent force;
The sound of its going was rushing and loud,
But I could not tell its course.

Yet methought when the lightning gleam was past,
And the thunder crash was done,
That I heard the voice of the war-worn blast,
Like the harp's expiring tone.

Then it rose in the valley and circled the hill,
Like a lone bird seeking its nest,
That carols a loud and joyous trill,
Before it retires to rest.

"My task is finished," I fancied it cried,
"I can sleep to the coming morn;
I will fold these wings so wild and wide,
Till the earliest dawn is born.

"Then springing up will I soar aloft,
Far over the seas' blue space;
Or fan with breezes all gentle and soft,
Young childhood's tiny face.

"I bend the pine on the mountain's top,
I curl the mist on its brow,
And shake the dew from the violet's cup,
As I sweep o'er the meadow below.

"I kiss the roses on beauty's cheek,
And heighten their lovely bloom;
I play on her brow amid lilies meek,
And sigh o'er her grassy tomb.

"Lo, anchor'd navies array'd for war,
Await my changeful breath;
And I speed them o'er the ocean afar,
Or hurl them down to death.

"I journey in no contracted path,
I heed no voice but *One*,
And I traverse the earth in blessing or wrath,
Regarding that voice alone.

"Oh! it spoke in power when once I rush'd
In fury o'er Galilee's waves;
When mortals heard it my roarings were hush'd,
And I slunk to my secret caves.

"Again shall I heed that holy *One*
When the trumpet sounds abroad;
And my honour'd voice to his judgment throne
Shall bear the elect of God.

Review.

The last two numbers of the series of papers that we have just concluded, have been Reviews in fact, though not in name—reviews of Dr. Beman's seven numbers, entitled "Review and Vindication"—And the last of our papers occupies, in our present number, a full proportion of the space usually assigned to this department of our work. We had some thoughts, however, of renewing, at this time—although it was somewhat sooner than we had anticipated a call to the duty—our remarks on a publication in the Christian Spectator; in which we are honoured with a notice of what appeared in the Christian Advocate three years ago, on "The best Method of conducting Christian Missions."

Our readers are generally aware that an ecclesiastical Convention met at Cincinnati, Ohio, in November last, with a view to devise, if they could, a plan for conducting missions in the valley of the Mississippi; which should terminate the conflict between the views and operations of the General Assembly's Missionary Board, and those of the American Home Missionary Society. The Convention was a favourite measure of the friends of the A. H. M. S., but it resulted in their grievous disappointment; inasmuch as they were found to be a minority in the body, in which they had cherished the expectation of carrying every thing agreeably to their wishes. But all who are acquainted with the agents and proceedings of that Society know, that they are not easily discomfited or discouraged. Accordingly, when the Convention published the minutes of their proceedings, which they did in full detail, some of those who had been members of the Convention and found themselves in a minority, came out, under the style of a committee, with a large pamphlet, complaining bitterly of the proceedings of the Convention, and censuring them with great severity. These publications—the proceedings of the Convention, and the appeal to the publick of the committee—are made the subject of a review, in the last quarterly number of the Christian Spectator of New Haven; and our readers would *guess* right, without being told, that the Spectator appears on the side of the Committee, and argues in their favour, with as much earnestness as if the cause were his own. Indeed we have no need here of any *as if;* for the cause is really his own. He is the advocate of Congregationalism in opposition to Presbyterianism; and the Home Missionary Society has been, and seems intended still to be, a principal instrument for converting Presbyterian institutions into auxiliaries of Congregational associations and operations. The Spectator seems to have determined to "take time by the forelock," and to send out, for the present year, this plea in favour of voluntary associations,

as preferable to ecclesiastical organizations in the great and benign work of sending the gospel to the destitute—in time to reach every part of the Presbyterian church before the next meeting of the General Assembly, at which this subject will doubtless come up for discussion. Perhaps, indeed, this publication is only the *precursor* of another, to be sent on, like the one of last year, to meet the Assembly *ad punctum temporis* when it shall be convened—How this may be time will disclose.

We by no means intend what we now write as a regular Review of the Spectator's Review—We have neither time nor space for such a work; and if we had, we think it would be needless. We do not speak merely our own opinion, but that of one gentleman at least, who has been accustomed to look into the Christian Spectator for entertainment and instruction, when we say, that this last born of his children is *an abortion.* The gentleman, to whom we have referred, seemed to think, as we certainly do, that the most plausible argument used by the Spectator, in favour of voluntary missionary societies is, that without these, Congregational and Independent churches could not send out missions at all. And yet, who sees not, that if it is the scriptural doctrine that to the church, in its distinctive character, is committed the evangelizing of the world, it only follows that any particular church, whose organization will not admit of her taking a part in this great and glorious work, is not built, *quo ad hoc*, on the foundation laid, and the model exhibited, in the word of God. The Spectator, in reasoning on this point, makes *a petitio principii*—takes for granted a controverted point, that Independent and Congregational church government is scriptural; and therefore that missionary operations conducted by *churches* are not scriptural, since they cannot be carried on by Independent and Congregational churches in their distinctive character—inasmuch as every such church is a little, unconnected, independent republick, not adequate by itself to sustain an extended Christian mission. But turn the argument the other way, which we think may be done with quite as much, or rather a great deal more, propriety and force; and then it will follow that Independency and Congregationalism are not scriptural, because they do not admit of the scriptural method of conducting Christian Missions.

We pretend not to say who is the writer of this Review; but if we should indulge in conjecture, we should be inclined, from one circumstance, to *guess* that it was Dr. Beman; because it has adopted his *slang*, of calling those who prefer Presbyterianism to Congregationalism, "The High Church party." It has also a considerable share of his rancour, against all who wish to sustain the Presbyterian church in its integrity, according to their ordination vows. But be its author who he may, his reasonings are feeble and inconclusive; and we leave it to our brethren in the West, who are perfectly competent to the work, and have, we are glad to perceive, already begun it, to expose the misrepresentations and evil tendency of the pamphlet and the whole cause, of which the Spectator has come forward as an advocate and auxiliary.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence, etc.

Indian Curiosities.—The Cherokee Phœnix, in a late number, gives a curious account of certain mining appearances of an ancient character to be found in that nation. The writer reports himself to have visited Valley River, in search of gold, where, from reports which he had heard, he felt disposed to visit some certain location upon the north side of the river, in which these appearances are met. The ridge in which they appear is covered with Indian tumuli, the skeletons only partially concealed by loose rocks from the eye. In the immediate neighbourhood large bodies of earth have been thrown, evidently, says our visiter, for the purposes of mining, and in search of some metal. In support of this, a well of antique construction makes its appearance near thirty feet in depth—here too, through the ridge or hill, runs a canal, six or eight feet deep, about ten wide, and thirty yards long. Two or three hundred yards distant, the mining evidences, broken by the numerous tumuli, reappear.

Here we have a pit of considerable depth, calculated to measure 30 feet in diameter. The earth is thrown up around it, in such a manner and quantity, as proves it to have been the result of human labour.—At a little distance the remains of a furnace are found, convenient to a small fountain at the head of a ravine; and supposed to have been erected for the purpose of separating the gold or silver, or less valuable metals, from the rocks. These works are all antique in their appearance, and resemble nothing of their supposed nature employed in modern times. The traditions of the natives uniformly agree that "about one hundred years ago, a company of white people came over the great waters in pursuit of gold and silver; that they spent several months at the above named places." An old Indian, who resides within a few miles of the place, says that he is one hundred years old; and that when he was a very little boy, a large company of white men manufactured lead, and gave it to the inhabitants. This company it is stated took their departure, probably finding their labours unproductive, and have been traced, says the writer, back to Europe, from whence and whom, letters in relation to these relics, have been received.—He does not tell us from what quarter of Europe they came, or to what quarter they went.

Partridges.—We have regretted the great destruction of this bird by the hard winter of 1830–31. Every farmer is acquainted with the extraordinary increase of the insect tribe, that prey upon his fruit trees, his corn and his grass. When he reflects upon its habits, passing over his fields in large flocks, and devouring all the insects in their course, some estimate may be formed of the loss sustained by the absence of the Partridge. We would, therefore, call upon every farmer who regards the beauty and productiveness of his fruit trees and his fields, not only to prevent the destruction of these birds, where any remain, but to protect them, by driving from his domain the gunner by whom they are pursued.

"The young remain in the nest the first day they are hatched, and the next follow the parent birds in search of food, which for several succeeding days consists of those small insects which are found adhering to the blades of grass; they afterwards feed on ants' eggs, larger insects, and blades of grass.

"At the season when the partridge is produced, the various species of ants loosen the earth about their habitations. The young birds therefore have only to scrape away the earth, and they can satisfy their hunger without difficulty. A covey that some years ago excited the attention of the Rev. Mr. Gould, gave him an opportunity of remarking the great delight they take in this kind of food. On his turning up a colony of ants, and retiring to some distance, the parent birds conducted their young to the place where they fed very heartily. After a few days, they grew bold, and ventured to eat within ten or twelve yards of him. The surrounding grass was high; by which means they could, on the smallest alarm, immediately run out of sight and conceal themselves. The excellence of this food for partridges may be ascertained from those that are bred up under a domestic hen; as, if constantly supplied with ants' eggs and fresh water, they generally arrive at maturity." —*Harrisburgh Chronicle.*

Frazee's Bust of John Jay.—The bust of the venerable and illustrious Jay, by Frazee, which we mentioned some time since as in course of execution, is now finished, and placed for public inspection in the upper halls of the Merchant's Exchange, in this city. In the course of a few days it will be removed to the capitol at Washington, where it is destined to be placed, in the Supreme Court Room. Mr. Frazee is the first instance of a native American sculptor employed by Congress. He has executed the task assigned to him with talent and taste, and the fine intellectual head of the revolutionary statesman, comes from his hands with no diminution of its native dignity of expression and attitude. The artist has been in-

debted for the likeness, to the bust of Jay by Ceracchi, but the composition and accessories are his own. The drapery is well managed, and the execution of the whole bust so delicate and accurate, as to bear the minutest inspection. On the whole, it is a grand and striking head, and does great credit to the artist.

A Singular Geological Fact.—In digging out the foundation of the projected Exchange Coffee House, in Dock street, in this city, the workmen came to an old tan yard, with a part of the former vats in place. There appears to have been a natural spring and a run of water, upon the ancient banks of which the vegetable remains are converted into a black combustible substance, resembling PEAT. Some persons were astonished to find the planks of the vats in such a state of preservation, but this is one of the properties of peat. In the B. Philosophical Transactions for 1734, there is a letter from Doctor Balguy, giving an account of the preservation of two human bodies in peat for 59 years. The one, a male, was perfect, his beard was strong, the hair of his beard was short, and his skin hard, and of a tanned leather colour; the joints of his legs played freely, without the least stiffness. The other, a female, was more injured, but her hair was like a living person's.

The corner stone of the "Hospital for the Blind and Lame" was laid on Monday last. The edifice is to be raised in pursuance of directions made in the last testament of JAMES WILLS, Esq. whose beneficent bequest for such an institution is well known.

By a calculation, it appears that allowing 32 years for a generation, and reckoning 5,287 years from Adam to the present time, that 145 thousand millions of human beings have existed on the earth since the system of our globe commenced.

Rail Roads.—There are now finished, in progress, and projected, in the United States, *two thousand nine hundred and thirty-eight miles* of Rail Roads.

Religious Intelligence.

FOREIGN.

We believe that the greater part of our readers feel rather more deeply interested in the Missions which are established in Ceylon and the Sandwich Islands, than in, perhaps, any other that are going forward in foreign lands; not because these missions are more important than others, but from the circumstance that they have directly contributed to these, more than to others; and that some have friends and relations employed in these Missionary fields. We fill, for the present month, most of the limited space which our pages allow to Religious Intelligence, with the most recent accounts of the state of the missions established in the island of Ceylon, taken from the Missionary Herald for April.

CEYLON.

Extracts from the Journal of Mr. Poor at Batticotta.

"The last extracts from Mr. Poor's journal were inserted at pp. 371—3 of the last volume, extending to March 31, 1831. The members of the church in the seminary are employed during their vacations as readers, exhorters, and distributors of tracts among the people. The loss of the mission-house and property at Manepy by fire was noticed in the last volume, p. 369.

"*April* 9, 1831. From the reports made by the church members this evening of what they saw and heard during the vacation, it appears that the heathen enjoy a great triumph; in consequence of the burning of the mission premises at Manepy. They affirm that that event furnishes decisive proof that their god, Ganesa, is superior to the God of the Christians. When reminded that the Tamul temples are sometimes robbed, and sometimes burnt, together with the idol gods which they contain; they readily admit that such occurrences are proofs of the imbecility of their gods; but it is enough that they may now, as they think, bring a similar proof against the ability or willingness of Jehovah to protect the missionaries. The burning of the premises furnishes a very good occasion for bringing to view some important principles of the government of God, and of his dealings towards his people.

"10. Sabbath. Preached from the text 'Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward,' showing the benevolent designs of the Almighty in bringing afflictions upon persons of various descriptions.

Visit of the Bishop of Calcutta to the Station.

"*April* 15. Early this morning, according to a previous arrangement, the bishop of Calcutta, with several other gentle-

men, and all the missionaries in the district, with one exception, visited the station. Agreeably to appointment, the members of the female boarding school from Oodooville, and of the preparatory school at Tillipally, assembled here. Before breakfast the female school, arranged in order with their sewing and books, were introduced to the notice of the company. Each scholar was required to read a small portion from the New Testament, and in turn to answer questions which the bishop proposed to them, by means of an interpreter, on the leading truths of Christianity.

At half past ten o'clock we assembled in Ottley Hall (being the first time it has been occupied on any publick occasion) for an examination of the members of the preparatory school, and seminary. After a few remarks relative to the origin and progress of our boarding school system, two classes were hastily examined in English spelling and the first rules of arithmetick. A schedule was then presented containing the course of study pursued by each of the four classes in the seminary, during the last three months, with a request that the bishop would have the goodness to select those branches in which he might wish to have the students examined, it being obviously impossible to examine them in their whole course, in a single day. The fourth class consisting of thirty members were first examined, half of them in construing the New Testament from English to Tamul, and the other half in vulgar fractions. The third class, twenty in number, were then examined in the first lessons on astronomy. The second and third classes were minutely examined in Scripture history and chronology. This exercise was closed by the members of the second class, eighteen in number, repeating each one a different portion of Scripture, selected by himself, proving that the great events represented by the stone spoken of in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, 'which was cut out without hands, and which smote the image,' &c, will be accomplished in their time, viz. 'In the days of these kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.' After a short recess, the first class, twenty in number, were examined in Euclid's Elements, and in the Gospel of Luke.* A few specimens of declamation were then given on subjects relating to the Hindoo system of mythology and science, closed by an address to the bishop, pronounced by a member of the first class, (though not composed by him) in behalf of his fellow-students; the object of which was to describe in a few particulars the nature of the mental process, relating both to science and religion, through which the members of the seminary have passed, from the time of their being brought under the tuition of the missionaries to the present period. After the address the bishop expressed the gratification he had felt on the occasion, and also presented some weighty considerations to induce the students to persevere in the course on which they have entered, assuring them of his best wishes, and of his readiness to co-operate with the conductors of the seminary in forwarding their designs.

"Thus ended the exercises of a very busy day. On comparing this examination with those that have preceded it, two circumstances are worthy of notice as being peculiar. One is, that a far greater portion of time than usual was spent in the examination of the classes in biblical studies; the other, that the bishop acted the part of an examiner in all branches, to a greater extent than any other person who has hitherto visited the seminary. Before taking leave of us, he intimated that it was his intention to furnish us with some memento of his visit, and of his cordial approbation of our plans of procedure. He also requested a statement of particulars relating to the destruction of the mission premises at Manepy, saying it was his intention to use his influence, in procuring subscriptions in aid of the repairs of the station.

"As a substitute for many remarks that might be made, expressive of our views of the character of bishop Turner, I shall only observe that his whole deportment was such as forcibly to remind us of the description of bishops drawn by the pen of inspiration. All who are interested in the welfare of Zion have, we think, cause for special thanksgiving to the great Head of the church, for appointing in his providence such a personage to preside over the interests of the infant church in India. The reflection that we are co-workers together with him in the same part of our Master's vineyard, cannot fail to quicken and encourage us in our work.

"This excellent prelate, of whom the missionaries speak with so much respect and affection, and who seems to have secured the love and esteem of all the friends of Christianity in India, has fallen a sacrifice to the excessive labours required of him by his extensive diocese. He died on the 7th of July, soon after his return to Calcutta from the visitation in which

* "In the latter branch they were examined in accordance with a method of studying the Scriptures recently introduced into the seminary, a correct idea of which may be formed by considering the following questions as specimens, viz. What are the contents of the 10th chapter of Luke? What subject is treated of in the 18th chapter? Where may we find the parable of the unjust steward?"

he was engaged when on the island of Ceylon. Mr. Winslow remarks that the spirit manifested by bishop Turner, and his whole conduct while at Jaffna corresponded well with the character given of a bishop by Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy. Bishop Middleton, the first who was raised to the episcopal dignity in India, died on the 8th of July, 1822. Bishop Turner is the fourth bishop of that diocese who has died within nine years.

"Mr. Poor proceeds—

"*April* 17. Sabbath. At half past six o'clock, attended church at Jaffnapatam where one hundred and five persons, of different classes, were confirmed by the bishop. At eleven o'clock attended church again. The bishop preached from the text, 'And Jacob vowed a vow unto the Lord.' In the afternoon I preached in Tamul, at Nellore, from 'Better that thou shouldst not vow than that thou shouldst vow and not pay.' Several natives who were admitted to the rite of confirmation in the morning were present.

"18. Returned to Batticotta in the evening. Since the bishop's arrival in Jaffna, I have at different times had favourable opportunities of learning some of the results of his extensive observation on missionary and other kindred subjects. In view of all that I have heard, I am much strengthened in the belief of some important principles of a practical nature, which I had adopted as the result of my own experience and observation, during my residence among the heathen; particularly, that no substantial and permanent advantages can reasonably be anticipated from the diffusion of general knowledge among the Hindoos, excepting so far as it is accompanied with a knowledge of Christianity, the only system which the only wise God has seen fit to reveal for man's guidance; that consequently, school-book societies, proceeding on the principle of furnishing books on science and general knowledge, to the exclusion of those of a religious nature, are performing a hazardous experiment: for though there are Bible and tract societies in the country, it by no means follows, either in theory or practice, that those natives who receive supplies of books on science from the book societies will receive books on moral and religious subjects from other quarters; that when the natives become sufficiently enlightened by science and general knowledge to discover the absurdities of the prevailing system, they must almost of necessity be driven to atheism or to the worst species of deism, unless the requisite means are put into their hands for becoming acquainted with the true God and Jesus Christ his Son, whom to know aright is life eternal; consequently, that native free-schools, taught by heathen school-masters, which, in consequence of their distance from missionary stations, or for any other reason, do not admit of a vigilant superintendence and direct Christian influence, promise little or nothing in favour of the progress of divine truth; that that delicacy of feeling against interference, which prevents the introduction of the Scriptures and other religious books into native schools, arises from a very questionable source; and that the alleged difficulty and danger of a gradual and prudent introduction of these books are to a great extent imaginary. In view of this subject we have reason to be well satisfied with what we consider to be the leading feature in our projected college, and which is expressed in the following extract from the prospectus.

"It is the moral influence which the projectors of the present seminary wish to keep primarily and most distinctly in view. Should it even appear singular, they are not ashamed of the singularity of attempting to found a college, not so much literary as religious; and indeed literary no farther than learning can be made auxiliary to religion. In a word, their design is to teach the knowledge of God; and developing all the important relations of the creature to the Creator for time and eternity.

NOTICES OF OODOOVILLE.

"*Seriousness among the People.*—After mentioning that a number of the schoolmasters, were anxious respecting their salvation; and that six individuals, including two girls of the school, were candidates for admission to the church, and that of ten or twelve others he was indulging hopes, while the seriousness of others was wearing off, Mr. Winslow, under date of April 1, 1831, proceeds—

"Every degree of excitement produced by the proper use of the means of grace, and through the influence of the Spirit of truth, is attended with hope; as those once awakened (at least among this people) generally become more susceptible of subsequent impressions, and often, after several seasons of awakening, followed by relapses, are at length hopefully converted. A number of cases which have occurred of this character encourage us in regard to those who were awakened, but appear now to be again falling asleep; and excite the hope that many of them, especially many of the children in the schools, may be truly converted at some future period; and that the late excitement may, in their case, be a preparation for a more thorough work. In this view, as well as in looking at those who already give some evidence of piety, the recent display of divine grace calls for our warmest thanksgiving.

"*Schools.*—The female boarding-school had received two girls from families more respectable than those from which they

were usually obtained. The native free-schools were prosperous, containing 650 boys and 140 girls. Number of schools connected with the station was 20.

Preachers Licensed.—Of the young men who have attended the theological class, Nathaniel Niles and Charles A. Goodrich, received license and public designation as preachers of the gospel and candidates for ordination on the 20th January, at our quarterly communion Timothy Dwight was also examined and approved in respect to his qualifications, but some family reasons and the state of his health prevented his receiving license. The young men who received license also received a public charge, in the presence of the church and congregation. In the afternoon of the same day they both, for the first time, went into the pulpit, and after Goodrich had read and expounded a portion of scripture and prayed, Niles preached an impressive sermon, in which he enforced the duty of the native church to raise up and send forth native preachers.

NOTICES OF PANDITERIPO.

Dr. Scudder, under date of April 1, remarks that he did not know that any new cases of conversion had occurred during the quarter. Most of those who had been awakened still attended the inquiry meeting. Two were candidates for the church. Truth appeared to be making an impression on the minds of many. All the children connected with the native free schools were formed into a Sabbath school, and the larger children and those who appear to be thoughtful are assembled for conversation every Sabbath and sometimes on Tuesday. The members of this class do good among their friends, by praying, reading, and conversation.

Dr. Scudder's labours among the Catholics were much as heretofore. Some new tracts had been printed and distributed. Great opposition was manifested and many of the Catholics had petitioned the governor to put a stop to these efforts to overthrow their religion.

The number of native free-schools was 14, containing 420 scholars; of whom 338 were boys, and 82 girls.

NOTICES OF TILLIPALLY.

Mr. Spaulding, under date of March 31, states that he had recently made a tour in company with five native helpers, to the pearl fishery, taking with him a few portions of scripture and 6,000 tracts, all of which they distributed, after reading and explaining them to the people. The candour manifested by the Catholics and heathen from the adjacent continent led him to suppose that a tour to that neglected field would do much towards preparing the way of the Lord. Many Protestants there have joined the Catholics, because they had no teacher qualified to teach them the gospel and administer the ordinances.

Preparatory School.—The preparatory school continues much as usual as to the progress made in learning. The excitement mentioned in my last quarterly report has had a happy influence on the morals of the school, and I indulge the hope that we may see lasting and most encouraging fruits. The names of the youth admitted on the last of December, 1830, are,

Names.	*By whom Supported.*	*Age.*
Breckenbridge, John	Female Mite Society, Baltimore, Md.	9
Carpenter, Elkanah	A legacy from E. C., Newport, N. H.	12
Crane, Elias W.	Ed. Soc., Springfield N. J.	15
Hopkins, Samuel	Ed. and For. Mis. Soc., Claremont, N. H.	13
Kollock, Henry	Hea. School Soc., Savannah, Geo.	15
Lawton, Luther,	A friend, Burton, Ohio.	8
Lincklain, John	Miss H. A. L. Lincklain, C., N. Y.	14
McLean, Allen	Young Men's Union, Simsbury, Con.	11
Miller, Samuel	Soc. Theol. Sem., Princeton, N. J.	8
Morrison, William	Individuals, Londonderry, N. H.	12
Osborne, Truman	Ladies, Charleston, S. C.	11
Pillsbury, Levi	Young Men's Soc. Winchendon, Ms.	11
Patterson, James	G. W. Coe, Esq., Savannah, Geo.	11
Riggs, David	Rev. E. Riggs, New Providence, N. J.	11
Rogers, Ezekiel	Gent. and Ladies Asso., Rowley, Ms.	8
Stafford, Ward	Females, Charlestown, Ms.	11
Summerfield, John	Fem. Mite Soc. Baltimore, Md.	10
Swett, Samuel		
Williams, Stephen	Fem. Mite Soc. Baltimore, N. Y.	9
Woodbury, Curtis	Ladies, Cumberland and N. Yarmouth.	10

In this list there are names of some boys who were in the school before, and in one or two cases the names of boys who formerly came as day scholars. The reason is, where we had evidence that the payments were continued, and where the boy formerly taken almost immediately left the school we considered the benefactors entitled to another appropriation.

Church.—There has been one addition to the church during the quarter, and as the case is somewhat uncommon and encouraging, I will give the particulars.

Death of a Female Member.—The sister of the schoolmaster who died 27th of June, 1830, as mentioned in the quarterly account at that time, first came to the station, supporting her brother by one arm, but a short time before his death, I was pleased with her attention to him as it seemed more than is common among this people. Before he died, he exhorted her to leave idols and believe on Jesus Christ; and as his last dying charge, he told her to keep the Sabbath, to go to church, and to attend the weekly meet-

ings for women on Friday. With this she strictly complied; and though often very infirm and unable to walk far, she was seldom absent. She was uniformly attentive, and from week to week gave evidence that she gradually understood and profited by what she heard. About three months ago she became worse, so as to be unable to come to the station. As her body and strength wasted away, her mind became more clear and her faith and hope more strong. She often expressed a wish to join the church. About the middle of February, she sent to me, saying, "I shall not live: I shall soon die: I wish you to baptize me, and give me the sacrament before I die." Her uniform feelings at that time may be learned from a single expression. When asked if she loved Christ, she replied, "Yes. He is my trust, my only trust;" and reaching out her withered hands, she added, "I have laid hold of him: I will not let him go." When asked if she did not sometimes think of the idols, and feel inclined to trust to heathen gods, she said, "No, don't want, don't want," shaking her hands and head in disgust. On February 22d she was baptized and admitted to the ordinance of the Lord's supper. As she was unable to come to the church, or even to rise from her mat, we went to her house. Some mats were spread under a tree, and on them were seated a few of the neighbours, most of the boys in the preparatory school, and some of the church members. The old woman was then brought out by two females, one her daughter, and the other a member of the church, and supported in a sitting posture while we asked her of the hope which she had, and administered to her the ordinances. To all our questions she gave such attention and answers as showed that her heart was most deeply engaged and interested in what she was doing. She gradually wasted away until she was little more than an animated skeleton, but her mind was filled with the hope and anticipated joy of seeing her Saviour and of being like him. The last time I called on her before she died, her mind seemed to be in a very happy state. Before I left, she took hold of her daughter's hand and put it into mine, wishing me to teach her the way to heaven. On inquiry she said she bought rice and milk to the amount of three pence, for which she was indebted, and that she had nothing to pay. I found that all her expenses for different articles of food amounted to one penny a day. She died on the 1st of April, and was interred in the burying ground belonging to the church.

View of Publick Affairs.

EUROPE.

Advices have been received from Britain (Liverpool) to the first of March; and from France (Havre) two days less recent. The state of Europe is the same, in all material respects, as we exhibited it in our last number; and from no part of the world have we heard news of much importance in the past month. Our view of publick affairs therefore will be very summary.

In Britain two objects—the Cholera and the Reform Bill—engross the publick attention. The Cholera is in London and in Edinburgh; but in neither of those cities are the cases numerous; and in both, at the date of the last accounts, the disease seemed to be losing, rather than gaining ground. The physicians and publick journalists seem now to regard this epidemick as not terrifick; and as altogether unworthy of being regarded as so alarming, as it was at first considered.—The Reform Bill was still before the House of Commons, and its enemies were gaining strength in their opposition to it. In the House of Lords it was understood that it would be opposed with the same firmness, and with nearly as much force, as on a former occasion, when it was thrown out. The measure also of creating new peers, was less likely than some time since, to be adopted in the last resort. Indeed many believed, that the present ministry must resign.—The issue is yet doubtful; but it seems to us that either reform, or something more serious to the aristocracy, and perhaps to the monarch too, must ere long take place.

The controversy is not yet settled between Holland and Belgium. Holland steadfastly refuses to submit to the award of the London conference of the *Great Powers;* and it is said that Russia countenances her refusal. Troops are raised in both the contending States, and war is apparently threatened; but we suspect, and hope, it will all end *in fumo.*

In France we have noticed no new occurrence of importance, except that it is confidently stated that France has united with Britain, in declaring to the king of Spain that he shall not interfere in the concerns of Portugal—that he shall not favour Don Miguel in the expected conflict between him and Don Pedro, for the crown of that kingdom. If this be so, the *beloved Ferdinand* will be at some loss how to shape his course; and yet it is affirmed, that he is determined, at all risks, to support the cause of his friend and fellow tyrant. One division of Don Pedro's expedition had sailed from Belle Isle for Terceira, and another division, coming from France, had reached

the former Island. A serious invasion of Portugal will probably be soon attempted. It appears that several British ships of the line are now in the port of Lisbon; and the last accounts state, that a considerable fleet is under sailing orders from a British port, to join the force already before the Portuguese capital, with a view to attack it, if Spain should take part in the expected contest.

Greece, it appears, is in a state only less calamitous than when it was invaded by the Turks. The party of the late chief Capo d'Istrias, have pushed their measures till the patriots, as they are called, have arrayed themselves in arms, to oppose the partizans of the late authorities. A civil war is threatened, if it has not commenced. In the mean time, it is stated, that the *Great Powers*, without consulting either party, have appointed a Regent for Greece, who is yet a minor, and whose guardians are to exercise the powers of government in that unhappy country, till the minor is of age.

We hear nothing further in regard to the war between the Turkish Sultan and the Pacha of Egypt.

From ASIA we have nothing to report.

AFRICA is becoming a very interesting portion of our globe. It would seem as if this large and long benighted part of the earth, was likely before many years to exhibit a change, greatly for the better. The piratical powers on the coast of the Mediterranean are broken down and rendered inefficient by the conquest of Algiers. On the eastern part of the continent, the Pacha of Egypt is making changes for the better, though far short of what could be wished. On the south, the British colony is pushing far into the interior; and the blessed missionaries are extending their operations even far beyond the frontier of the colony, and with an encouraging success. But it is on the western coast that the brightest prospect appears. Liberia and Sierra Leone, under the patronage of the United States and Britain, are destined, we verily believe, to put an end, eventually, to the horrible traffick in the bodies and souls of men. The last arrivals from Liberia, bring the most cheering accounts of the prosperity of the Africo-American colony there. Health is enjoyed and enterprise is active, and the adjacent native tribes are courting the favour and friendship of the colony. Schools and churches are established, and nothing now seems to hinder the rapid extension of the colony, both along the coast and into the interior, but the want of a more efficient patronage from our country; and this we think cannot much longer be withheld.

AMERICA.

On the western coast of the southern part of our continent, the infant republicks existing there, are in a fluctuating state; yet, at present, not at war; and on the whole, we would hope, making some progress toward order and happiness. On the opposite coast, Buenos Ayres was, at the last accounts, rejoicing at the conclusion of the civil war, which has long existed, with less or greater activity, in the United Provinces. The Brazils, the deserted empire of Don Pedro, are still in a state of great agitation. Colombia, it is hoped, is likely to be tranquillized—only temporarily we fear. Mexico is embroiled in a civil war—but not as yet sanguinary. Central America is suffering more than any of her sister republicks, by the inveterate and mortal hatred to each other of the factions by which the country is continually distracted. The parties are, or have been, so nearly equal in power, that war has been incessant for years past; and when it is likely to terminate no one can tell.

In the United States we enjoy peace and outward prosperity; and if we are not a happy people, it must be our own fault. The breaking up of the last unusually severe winter, has produced inundations on several of our large rivers, especially in our western country, destructive of much property and some lives—and the number of deaths during the last four or five months—occasioned by influenza, scarlet fever, meazles and their consequences—is larger than we recollect at the same season of the year, on any former occasion. Our Congress is busily employed; and yet making but little progress, as seems to us, in bringing the important concerns of the session to a state of maturity. All the great measures—the tariff, the bank, the representation bill, &c.—are still under consideration. It appears that the state of Georgia is, at present, determined not to submit to the award of the Supreme Court, in the case of the missionaries. But we hope that on reflection, the folly, the infatuation, the incalculable evils, of resisting the general government, and thus destroying the Federal Union, will become so evident, that actual resistance will not be made. If it shall, all will suffer; but do not our southern brethren see that they have more at stake, and will be in more immediate and imminent peril than we of the north? May the same kind Providence which has hitherto saved our country in many a fearful crisis, still watch over us for good; and bring to a happy termination the present unpropitious controversy.

ERRATA *in our last Number.*

Page 89, 2d col. line 18 from bot. for *is* read *are*.
115, 2d col. line 15, for *publication* read *periodical*.
116, 1st col. line 24, from bot. dele the word *only*.
136, line 18 from bot. for *Saviour* read *Sovereign*.